A TREATISE OF THE SVFFERINGS AND VICTORY OF CHRIST, IN THE work of our redemption: Declaring by the Scripturs these two questions:

That Christ suffered for vs the wrath of God, which we may well terme the paynes of Hell, or Hellish sorrowes.

That Christ after his death on the crosse, went not into Hell in his Soule.

Contrarie to certaine errours in these points publiklie preached in London: Anno 1597.

1598.

BRITISH MUSEUM

That Christ suffered for vs the wrath of God: which we may well terme the *paines of Hell, or Hellish sorrowes.*

TO declare faithfully the *sufferings* of Christ our Saviour which for vs he endured, & how he cõquered the power of Hell & Sathan to free vs therefrõ, is a matter for all Christians (if any other) most worthy of handling, and necessarie to be known: Especially now seing of late great iniury hath bene done by no meane Prelate, to this poinct of christiã veritie, in such wise as no Protestant hath euer done the like heretofore, neither hath brought more offence to the godly, or disquietnesto the Churches in England. Therefore I could not forbeare, though all other, who are meeter then my self, keepe silẽce, but imploye my poore talent in this profitable seruice for the church of Christ, committing the whole successe vnto God, whose holy cause I labour to cleare from all the corrupt fancies & vaine imaginations of men in this behalfe.

The whole cõtrouersie hath in it 2. pointes

1. That Christ suffered for vs the wrath of God.

2. That after his death on the crosse, he went not into Hell in his soule.

The former of these is proued most soundly & euidently diuers wayes. First by *a generall* reason take from the *suffrings of the soule of Christ*, then by other *special and more immediat arguments*, as afterward by Gods grace shall well appeare.

A generall reason that Christ suffered the wrath of God.

Now then for the former thus we say & constantlie auowe: *Christ Iesus did suffer in his whole manhoode for the redemption and satisfaction of our sinnes: yea hee suffered properlie and immediatlie in his soule, and not in his flesh onely.*

Therefore he suffered for vs the wrath of GOD.

This *consequent* heere is manifest and can not bee denied. For what could touche the *soule* of Christe *immediatlie* and *properly* as he suffered and satisfied for our sinnes, but the displeasure and iust anger of God alone? What els can Christs *soule* bee subiect vnto *properly* and *immediatly* in regard of sorrowe and affliction, and that for sinne? But this *sequele* is not doubted of, or if it be, we shal haue occasiõ afterward to declare it further, The *antecedent*, or firste part of the former *generall reason* is denied & confidently reiected: yet howve falsly by Gods helpe, by that whiche followeth, shall easilie appeare.

Wherein it behoueth, that first we consider, how we meane and holde this assertion,

tion, which is namely thus: That Christ suffered in his soule not onely by *Sympathy* or ioint feeling with his body and arising from his body. It is true in deede that so he suffered in his soule, as also mutuallie in his body by *Sympathy* from his soule, for his body els had bene senseles & dull, and without all feeling. But heere we meane that his soule had further some sufferings that were proper and immediatlie rising in and from the soule: Such as the flesh of Christ no vvayes caused, neither coulde fully apprehend. As *feare, sorrow, temptatiõ, anguish of minde*, a bitter *sense of Gods* iust and seuere *wrath*, & all these directly for sinne which he vndertooke on him self for vs.

Howe wee meane that *Christ* suffered in his *soule.*

And this first God willing, shalbe proued. Then after, the contrarie reasons refuted. This then is proued in Mat. 26. 28. *My soule is euery way sorrowfull* (perilypos) *vnto death, or compassed with sorrowes vnto death.* None will denie but *my Soule* heere is properlie the very humane soule of Christ. Also it is plaine, this grieuous passion was in his soule *immediatlie and properly*, not growing by any hurt of his flesh, seeing then his bodye was not touched with anie smart. And lastly that this was for the bitter punishment of our sinnes which hee nowe directlie susteined in his *soule*, and yet was further to susteyne, we ought not by anie reason to doubt. For lette vs mark: the whole text here, and in all the

The antecedent of the generall reason proued. 1.

Euangelists doth shew that the only matter he was nowe going about, and especiallie troubled withall, was the verie sufferings of him selfe as man *for vs*, the full sacrifice & sinne offring *of our* redemption. Nothing els nowe appeareth in the text to haue disquieted him. Wherfore also he saith, *Father, saue me from this hower. Lett this cuppe passe from me: if it be possible lett this cuppe passe from me.* What if hee also had *care and compassion for his countreymen the Iewes?* What, if he forgot not his *Apostles and poore Church*, now to be left behinde as sheepe amongst Wolfes? Doeth that hinder or diminishe this his passion *for sinne?* Or doe not these wordes and other circūstances of the text declare, that now chiefly, yea only, he was troubled about his *suffering for our sinne*. His care of his *Apostles and Church* he vnburthened him selfe of, *Iohn 17.* a little before he entred into this conflict of his passion *Iohn 18.1.* That *for Ierusalem and the Iewes* he was particularlie touched withall not longe before, *Mat. 23. 37.* & *cap. 24.* So that those affections do seme *there* to haue their proper place. And the time after appeareth, namely *in the garden & on the crosse* to be left chieflie, yea only, for his sorrowes & sufferings for the redemptiō of sinnes. Thus then let no man thinke it presumption to say expresly what did nowe in this sort greeue the Lorde, and cause in him this heauines. Him selfe we see telleth vs expreslie,

preſlie, therefore we may expreſlie ſay it: *This his hower* of ſuffring for ſinne, *This cuppe* of affliction and ſorrowe which nowe he felt and was to feele yet further, cauſed him ſo to mourne and feare. If you ſay, It was a paſſion in deede of the ſoule, it was ſorrow, it was feare, and much heauines, & that for our ſins, but yet it was direct-lie *becauſe* of his bodilie death & torments which were nowe *neere* at hand. Or els he feared in deede Gods wrath towards him for ſins, but he felt it not. I anſwer, 1. That former is not ſo: It is no leſſe then impi-ous to affirme that only his bodilie death and outward paines ſhould ſo terrifie and diſmay him: as in the next more ſpeciall arguments we ſhall further declare. 2. A-gaine, he both *feared* and *felt* Gods anger for the ſinne of the worlde: as alſo in the ſaid ſpeciall argumentes we ſhall ſee fur-ther. But this obſerue nowe: yet this firſt general reaſon is graunted. If this in deed were feare of Gods wrath, then *Chriſt ſuffe-red for our ſinnes properlie and immediatlie in his ſoule, not in his fleſhe onely.* *He feared, he had ſorrow, aſtoniſhment, miſerie, and much anguiſhe of minde, & that for our ſinnes. Nowe whether this were onely Feare or what ſo euer more, this is cleare and cer-ten, Chriſt had theſe ſufferinges in his ſoule *properly*, and from his ſoule *immediat-lie*, as being the ſufferings for our ſinnes.

Obiection.

Aunſwere.

*Lypē, perilypos, tetarachtai, ecthambeisthai, ademonein, &c.

But for all this there is doubt hereof

* 1. Pet. 2. 24. †Col. 1. 20. * verse 22. †Rom. 7. 4. * Reuel. 5. 9. †1. Iohn 1. 7.

in some, because it is written, *Hee bare our sinnes in his body on the tree. † He reconciled vs by the blood of his crosse. * He reconciled vs in the body of his flesh through death. † We are dead to the law by the body of Christ. * He redemed vs to God by his blood. † The bloud of Christ cleanseth vs from all our sinnes.* This is a cõstant phrase throughout the scriptures, attributing our whole remission of sinnes to the *bodily* sufferinges of Christ only and to his *bloodshed*, and not to anie thing of the soule. *If all these places of scripture should bee* figuratiue, *noting but the parte for the whole, Christes* body, *when there is meant his* soule *too, they are strange* figures *that runne alwayes so, Gods worde neuer yeelding anye one such proper speech throughout the scripture, that Christ suffred for vs in his* soule.

Answere.

I answer: First, the meaning of those places is to ascribe our whole remission of sinnes only to Christ & his sufferings: and to exclude all other means without or besides Christ, but not to exclude any parte of Christe, though only some parte be mentioned. 2. Therfore vve say further: These places of scripture are not proper and literal, but *figuratiue* in deede: they doe note but the parte for the whole, sometimes Christes *body*, sometimes his *flesh*, somtimes his *blood*, when *the whole man Christ* is plainlie vnderstoode consisting both of a *body* hauinge flesh and blood, and also of a *soule*. Otherwise we must saye, These very scriptures before mẽtioned, are at open iarre in thẽselues, if we take them literally. Some say his

his body, ſome *his blood* cleanſeth vs from all ſin. Againe, his body *on the tree* only did beare our ſinnes, and his ſufferings of all his life before were not meritorious nor helpfull at all for vs, not his *pouertie*, not his *ſhame*, not his being *rayled* vppon, nor any his *perſecutions* before his very death on the tree. For ſo theſe places ſound being literally & ſtrictly vnderſtood: which how falſe it is, I need not, I hope to declare. In like ſort it is ſaid, *The figure that ſaueth vs is Baptiſme.* What? Therfore doth baptiſme ſaue vs *only*? Doth not the *Lords ſupper*? Doth not the *word preached* alſo? *The word was made fleſh:* was it onely made *fleſh* and not a humane *ſoule* to? *In the dayes of his fleſh he offred vp prayers and ſupplications with ſtronge cryes.* Was it not in the dayes when he had both *fleſh* & *ſoule* alſo? *He tooke not the ſeede of Angels but he tooke the ſeed of Abrahã.* He tooke humane *fleſh* & *ſoule* to, did he not? *Let not ſinne raigne in your mortall bodyes:* I hope he meaneth *neither in our ſoules* nor bodyes *Sacrifice & offering thou wouldeſt not haue: but a body thou ordayneds me:* yea both *a body and a ſoule* too. *The fornicator ſinned againſt his* our body, & no leſſe ſurely againſt his *ſoule* alſo. It were infinit to ſhew you the phraſes of ſcripture, whiche in ſpeaking of the *outward parte* onely, yet alwayes they ſignifie the *intire & whole mã.* The reaſõ wherof, eſpecially in *Chriſts ſuffrings*, doth ſeeme to be this, becauſe the woũds of his *body* & ſheading forth of *his blood*, are moſt aparant & euident to ſenſe:

and

and therefore are they ſo commonly named in ſtead of the *whole* ſufferinges, the reſt whereof were not open to our ſenſes. Againe, becauſe *his bodily death on the croſſe*, and his *ſheading of bloud* there, was the finall accompliſhment of all his ſufferings what ſoeuer. Therefore this in ſtead of all the reſt is vſuallie named, and yet the reſt neuer excluded. Howbeit for all this, note further, that we read *the verie phraſe* literallie and expreſlie *Iſai 53. 10. He made his ſoule ſinne*, or a ſacrifice for ſinne: The full meaning whereof ſhalbe more declared by & by in the next proofe of this general reaſon. Alſo where it is ſaid, *He was* *broken *for our ſinnes:* it can not be properlie meant of Chriſtes *body*, his fleſh and bones. For it is written, *not a bone of his was broken:* Wherfore the meaning is, The ſorrowes & torments of his ſoule did *bruſe* and *breake him to pieces*, as the truth ſheweth he was, and became for vs in deede. If any reply, *The nayles and ſpeares did breake him:* Nay, they *pearced him*. But in no ſort can that be called **breaking* or *bruſing to pieces*, as the former word doth plainlie ſignifie.

* *Meduta.*

Obiection. Further it is obiected, The old ſacrifices of the Iewes were figures of our whole & abſolute redemption by Chriſt. But they ſignified no more but his bodily ſuffrings onely. Therefore Chriſtes ſufferinges for our redemption were only bodily.

Aunſwere. I anſwere, Firſt the *propoſition* is falſe, taking

king it generallie. The carnall *ſacrifices* of the Iewes ſignified that which they were apt to teach and ſignifie: but not any further. Therefore they ſignified that the redemption of men ſhould haue a true bodily ſacrifice with the ſheading of blood: yea whatſoeuer was carnall & ſenſible in it might be ſignified by them. But not the inward and inviſible thinges that did neceſſarily concurre in and with this bodily ſacrifice: for the which thoſe carnal types were altogither vnfit, neither had they anie reſemblance togither. As firſt the meritorious ſacrifice muſt haue of neceſſitie the *Deitie* conioyned in perſon with it. This ſacrifice muſt bee the body & blood *of God:* or els it could neuer ſatisfie, nor deſerue the fauour of God for the worlde. But the ſacrifices of beaſts could not prefigure this perſonall vnion of God and man in the true ſacrifice togither. Therefore they ſignified not all the neceſſarie pointes in the meritorious ſacrifice. Againe thoſe *beaſts* ſacrifices could not prefigure the immortall & reaſonable ſoule of Chriſt: whiche it was neceſſarie hee ſhould haue to be our redeemer. Thirdly it was neceſſarie that this ſacrifice of our full redemption, ſhould not only dye, but alſo reuiue again: euen the victorious reſurrection of his fleſh from death was neceſſarie. As it is written, *He died for our ſinnes, and roſe againe for our iuſtification.* But the *ſacrifi-*

crificed beastes neither could nor did signifie any such thing. Therfore the *propositio* before is false, *The olde sacrifices of the Iewes were not resemblances & figures of our whole and absolute redemption by Christ.* They serued only to represent such partes therof as they were apt and fit to teach and signifie. *Secondly*, I deny the *assumption* before going also. The Iewes sacrifices, that is certaine of them, did signifie more then the *bodily* sufferings onely, they set forth the sufferinges of the *soule* of Christ also. In the 16. chapt. of *Leuit.* *verse 5.* we haue a *sinne offering* consisting of Two Goates, the one *slayne*, the other the *scape goate*: yet both of them *a sacrifice for sinne*, as the text speaketh. What doeth the *slayne Goate* figure but the *body* of Christ slayne, the *scape-goate* the *soule* which also *bare our sinnes*, and was a *sinne offeringe*, but yet suruiued and dyed not as the body of Christ did. The *scape-Goate* heere surelie muste of necessitie signifie the *Soule* or the *Deitie* of Christ. The *Deitie* it can not signifie, becausе that can not bee a *sinne offering*. Therefore it signifieth that the immortall *Soule* of Christ was a *sinne offeringe*: and being a sinne offering, or a sacrifice for sinne, it did properlie beare our sinns, and suffer for our sinnes.

If any saye, *This scape-goate* suffered not as the *slayne goate* did, but was *sent away* free and vntouched. Thus then the Soule of Christ

Christ must scape and not suffer when his body suffered.

I aunswere. The *scaping* of this Goate may signifie the *Soules immortalitie*, whiche died not when the body dyed. But that it *suffered* in that kinde which the soule can suffer, it is manifest by this, that it was *an offering* or *sacrifice for sinne*, and *bare our sinnes* as well as the body, which is like the slain Goate, whiche sensibly and apparauntlie died. Againe, the sacrifice in *Leuit. chap. 6* called the *Holocaust*, or *whole burnt offeringe*, doeth liuelie prefigure the sufferinge of the *whole Manhood* of Christ for our sinnes, that is both in his soule and bodye. For in other sacrifices *certen partes* of the sacrifices were reserued and not burnt. But in this *the whole*, and euery whit being chopt and cut into pieces, it was *altogither* put into the fire, and burnt: and so it was by a speciall name called The *whole burnt offering*. Euen so, not the body onely, but also the Soule of Christ, euen euery whitt, of his humanitie, was burnt and consumed in the fier of affliction, as a perfect *Holocaust* and a whole burnt offeringe for our sinnes.

By this we may easely see the answere to a like obiection of the *Sacramentes* of the newe Testament: When they saye, In them, like as in the Iewes sacrifices, nothing elsé is represented and signified, but Obiection.

but the bodily ſufferinges of Chriſt: Wee are to anſwere as we did before. Theſe are giuen of God to the Church to teach and repreſent that which they are apte and fit by their nature for, They are bodily and earthlie elementes: and therefore fit to ſet forth bodilie and aparant effectes in Chriſt: they can not ſet out the ſpirituall and inuiſible effectes in him. And yet the ceremonie of *breaking the bread*, which is to ſhewe forth how Chriſtes body was *broke for vs*, it can not belong properlie to the *body*, but to the *ſoule*, and to the body by *ſympathy* with the ſoule, as is before declared.

2. I proceed further to the ſecond proofe of this generall reaſon: *Iſay 53. 10. The Lord will breake him and make him ſubiect to infirmities, when he ſhall make his ſoule ſinne*, that is to ſay, a ſacrifice for ſinne. Here firſt we may note a plaine expreſſe phraſe, the verie letter ſounding that *his ſoule was made ſinne*, or a ſacrifice for ſinne: Neither is there anie vrgent reaſon why *ſoule* heere ſhould be ſo *figured* or *disfigured* rather, that the *humane ſoule* ſhould bee wholy excluded. I denie not but *his ſoule* heere doeth ſignifie *him ſelfe*, that is his humane nature intierlie and wholy. And that may bee notably ſhewed by comparinge the phraſe in the Apoſtle to the very ſame purpoſe, *2. Cor. 5. 21. He hath made him ſinne for vs whiche knewe no ſinne, that we might bee made the righteouſnes of God in him*. Heere that whiche the Prophet

phet meaneth saying, *He made his soule sinne*, the same the Apostle meaneth sayinge, *God made Him sinne for vs*. That is to say, him selfe wholy as man, not any one parte of him onelie. And this is literall. If any yet doubt, howe Christ was made *sinne* for vs in his soule, you may plainlie see heere in *Paule*. For he compareth *Christes being sinne for vs who knewe no sinne, and our being the righteousnes of God in him*, who haue *no righteousnes in our selues. As if he should say, *In like manner*, He hath borne our sinnes, as we haue receyued his righteousnes. But wee attaine the righteousnes of GOD by him both in our soules and bodyes: So likewise then, He was made sinne for vs, both in his soule & body. Otherwise this *similitude* or *comparison* were vneuen, and namely short on his parte, whiche ought not to be. Therefore surely, *he* was made sinne for vs (here in Paule) and *his soule* was made sinne (in Esaie,) signifieth *Hee himselfe* was, that is intirelie in both partes he was a sacrifice for sinne, euen *his soule and body*. As also the other phrase here in *Esay*, *He was broken*, doeth likewise prooue, as I haue enough declared thereof before.

No iustifying righteousnes.

Thirdlie, I proue this generall reason from †Heb. 2. where *the ende* & *reason* why

3.

† 14. Because the children tooke parte of flesh & blood, he also himselfe likewise tooke part with thē, that he might destroy through death him that had the power of death, that is the Diuell. 15. And that he might deliuer all them, which for feare of death were all their life time subiect to bondage. 16 For he in no sorte tooke on him the Angels, but he tooke the seed of Abraham. 17 Wherfore it behoued him in all things to be made like his brethren, &c.

Christ

Christ tooke on him the nature of man, is plainlie opened. He is said (verse 16.) *not to haue taken the Angels nature, but mans:* euen for this very cause & purpose, that he might suffer in that nature which he assumed, & by suffring in it he might saue it. Now he assumed (all men know) our humane *soule* aswell as our flesh, and he saued our *soule* aswell as our flesh, *ergo* he suffered both in *soule* and in flesh: and the Angels nature hee would not assume nor suffer in it, because he would not saue it. This reason is better concluded thus: If he assumed our whole humane nature to this very *end* & *purpose* that he might suffer in it, and by suffering in it, saue it: Then he also suffred both in body and in *soule*. But this is true, Hee assumed our whole humane nature to this verie *end* and *purpose*, that he might suffer in it, and by suffering in it, saue it, *Ergo* this is true also, that hee suffered both in *soule* and flesh. Heere onely the *assumption* can be doubted. It conteyneth in it three points.

1. *He assumed our whole humane nature.*
2. *That which he assumed he did assume to this very end & purpose, that he might suffer in it.*
3. *That by suffring in it, he might saue it.*

These three pointes being proued, the whole *Assumption* before is euident and firme. But they are all prooued in these verses of *Heb. 2. as the First, Verse, 14, 16, 17.*

Nei-

Neither doeth this let, that he ſpeaketh, namely but of *fleſhe and bloed*, verſ. 14. and of the *ſeede of Abraham* verſe 16. It can not be doubted but theſe phraſes are ſet downe *ſynecdochicor*, the part for the whole: and ſo the Author meaneth here, he aſſumed the *whole* humane nature. *The ſeconde* is proued verſe 14, 15, 17, 18. *The thirde* is proued verſe 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

If anie reply here, it is true no man euer doubted, but Chriſt ſuffered in his ſoule: that is by *ſympathy* or ioint feeling frō his body, according to the courſe of nature in him: but not as properly making to mans redemption, & ſo this to the *Hebrewes* here is to be vnderſtoode. Obiection.

Nay: that hath no reaſon in it. Chriſt aſſumed not our nature, nor any parte of it, but onely to ſuffer in it *properly* and *immediatlie*, euen for the very purchaſing of our redemption thereby. Otherwiſe hee had no neede to aſſume both, but either the one parte or the other. I ſay, if the *proper and immediate ſuffering* in one part of our nature onely, had bene ſufficient to ſaue vs wholy, then there was no ſimple neceſſitie that Chriſt ſhould aſſume both parts. For if God ſo would, and nothing but natures perfection and ſufficiencie had bin reſpected, then the aſſuming of one parte onely and the ſuffering in it, by this pretended reaſon, might haue bene able to haue ſaued vs *wholy* thorough the infinite Anſwere

excellencie of that perſon hauing the Diuine nature conioyned with it to ſupplie the vnſufficiencie of the Humane ſingle parte, either in doing or ſuffring. Thus *Apollinaris hereſie* will enter at this gap. Hee held that Chriſt aſſumed humane *fleſhe* indeed, but not any humane *ſoule*. For it needed not, ſaid he: His *Deitie* being ſufficient to be in ſteed of a *ſoule* in ſupplyinge vnto it all efficacie for naturall operations, and conſequentlie ſo farre to giue aſſiſtance to the Fleſh that it might be able to doe all things for our redemptiō without the *ſoule*, only through the helpe of the Godlie power ioyned therewith: As namely it could *quicken* it, and make it *moone*, and *liue*, and haue *knowledge*, and *feeling*, &c. Therefore his fleſh onely thorough the quickening and mouing of his *Godhead* might do the workes of righteouſnes, & ſuffer feelinglie the paynes ſufficient for our iuſtifying and ſauinge: and all this without a humane *ſoule*. So that the *ſoule* ſhould bee ſuperfluous & needles, which ſhould *properlie* doe nothing in the worke of our redemption. And if it were ſuperfluous and needles in Chriſt, how ſhall we hold that he had anie at all. Whiche *blaſphemie* God forbid. Therefore it is vaine to replie, and very falſe, that here *is meant, that Chriſt ſuffered in ſoule by *ſympathie* only, or a naturall ſuffering, when as this ſuffering *properlie* did not make to our redemptiō, nor

Apollinaris Hereſie.

Heb. 2. 14 &c.

was

was absolutely necessarie to make Christs Flesh to haue life and sense: the Soules *immediat* and *proper* suffring was necessarie to make it a ransome for sinne, and therefore we conclude that here this is specially signified.

Moreouer they obiect: That wherby Adam propagated sin into vs, by the same hath Christ procured satisfaction for vs. But Adam propagated sinne into vs *not by our soules* but *only by our flesh* which only wee deriue frō him: Therfore Christ *only by his flesh* and *not by his soule* hath procured satisfaction for vs. To this we answere simply by denying the *proposition*. By the same instrumēt Adam did not propagate sinne into vs by whiche Christ satisfied for vs. For Adam propagated and deriued sinne into vs, only by the flesh (suppoſing now that our soules are immediatly infused by God, & come not from our parents.) But Christ satisfied for vs both in his soule & flesh. Wherfore in this sēnse we denie the *ꝓpositiō* as being vtterly false. And in steed of this false argument I returne against it this reason better grounded and of certen trueth. *That whereby Adam firste and wee euer since doe most properly commit sinne, by the same hath Christ our second Adam made satisfaction for our sinne. But Adam first & we euer since most properly commit sinne in our soules, our bodyes beinge but the instrumentes of our Soules, and following the soules direction and will.*

Obiect.

Answ.

Therefore Christ in his ſoule chiefly and moſt properly made ſatisfaction for vs. Againſt this cõcluſion there can not by any reaſon, be a-nie deniall. All which as in it ſelf it is moſt certen, ſo alſo it may wel be gathered and groũded on the Apoſtle: *Like as by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners: ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many alſo be made righteous.* Rom. 5. 19. Where though chiefly the Apoſtle compareth Adams diſodedience with Chriſts obedience as both doe reach vnto vs: yet it is plaine he doeth iointlie ſignifie the *Subiect* alſo of their diſobeying and obeying, that is their *ſoule*, wherein they properlie wrought theſe thinges whiche did reach euen vnto vs. So that hence we reaſon thus: *Wherein Adam diſobeyed and Chriſt obeyed, by the ſame hee ſatisfied for vs and made vs righteous. But Adam diſobeyed God, and Chriſt obeyed principally in the ſoule. Therefore principallie and chiefly in his ſoule Chriſt ſatisfied for vs, & made vs righteous.* The *propoſition* onely is in queſtion, which here is plainlie gathered from the Apoſtle: and ſo both our Aſſertion is proued, and their *propoſition* before confuted. Now all this we anſwere graũting that mens ſoules are *not deriued* by propagation from their parentes. Which yet if any affirmed, there could follow no impietie nor abſurditie: neither reaſon nor religion can well ouerthrowe it. And thus alſo their *aſſumption* before is flatlie denied. Howbeit for my parte I will not fall

fall into this queſtiō here, being very difficult and not ſimply neceſſarie, *Whether our ſoules come by generation, as the body doeth, or no.* Becauſe I content my ſelfe with the opiniō of the moſt at this preſent, who being excellent learned and godly men denie this point, and yet notwithſtandinge for all that the former *aſſumption* may bee denied alſo. For who knoweth not that the ſoule is the proper and perperual *Subiect* of ſinne? So that where there is no liuing ſoule, there neuer was nor cā be any ſinne or diſobedience at all. The fleſhe therefore being not capable of ſinne and diſobedience, but by the ſoule and frō the ſoule (in the which alwayes it is properlie inhærens, if it *be* at all:) And ſinne beeing properly a ſpirituall qualitie alwayes, and no corporall pollution: it wil follow that Adam propagated ſin into vs † *by our ſoules* and not by our fleſh onely, whether our ſoules come by propagation, or infuſion, or howe ſo euer. Yet if any ſticke at this, howe ſinne can be deriued in propagatiō by and in the ſoule, if the ſoule be not deriued alſo. Lett vs not bee curious in this harde point, which needeth more *Philoſophie* then *Diuinitie* to declare it: holdinge faſt this moſt euident trueth, that *ſinne* is a proper and vnſeparable qualitie of the ſoule, and can not be found being in anie thing where a reaſonable ſoule is wāting. And therefore it is not deriued from our

† Zanchius de Oper. Dei.

parents in Flesh onely but in a Soule al-
ſo, the Soule beeing euer vnited to the
fleſh when ſo euer it is ſinfull. As for the
fleſhes ſinne, wee denie that it ſinneth pro-
perlie: but onely it partaketh of ſinne frō
the ſoule by ioyning with it and depen-
ding on it.

Obiect. Further it is ſayed, If Chriſtes bodilie death ſatisfie not, for the ſinne of our ſoules, then we haue no good by Chriſtes bodily death. For *our bodyes*, ſaye ſome, *haue no good at all by Chriſtes death, no more then the bodyes of Infidels: ſeeing we dye ſtill as well as they.* But wee haue much good no doubt by Chriſtes bloodſhed and *meere* bodilie death. Therefore the ſinne of our Soules is purged thereby. And if ſo, then that *his ſoule* ſhould alſo ſuffer for vs, is ſuperfluous.

Anſwer. The anſwere is: Firſt that is preſumed which is moſt falſe, That we preciſely ſay that Chriſtes *body* ſatisfied for our bodyes and his *ſoule* for our ſoules, yea each of thē in a ſeuerall and diſtinct kinde of ſatisfying: ſo that the ſufferings of the one profited not at all for the other, but *his body for our bodyes* and *his ſoule for our ſoules.* Whiche thing we neuer meant: but acknowledge the ſufferinges of the *whole man Chriſt* doe ſatisfie for vs *wholy*, without any ſuch preciſe partition. Neuertheles we knowe by Gods worde, and doe affirme, that God in his iuſtice regarded this proportion, that

as

as we haue ſinned both in our Bodyes & Soules, ſo he that was made our propitiation did purpoſelie and aunſwerably ſuffer both in his Body and Soule. I ſay anſwerablie to the † *proportion* of our ſinning. Now if anie with reſpect to this *proportion* do ſay, Chriſts *Body ſuffered for our bodyes, his Soule for our ſoules*, then is it a godlie and wholeſome ſaying, neither giueth it anie euill ſequele at all. But further then ſo, we meane not, we allowe not. Secondly the proofe of the firſte propoſition what *Paradoxe* is it, yea what impietie? *Haue our Bodyes no good at all by Chriſtes death, no more then the bodyes of Infidells, becauſe wee Dye ſtill as well as they?* Lett vs conſider this poinct: our Bodyes haue manifolde benefites by Chriſtes death. 1. Sinne is not imputed againſt vs at all, yea wee are clothed with Chriſtes righteouſneſſe both in our *bodyes* and ſoules, when we are once iuſtified by faith in his death. 2. Sinne is abated and mortified in vs daylie, and righteouſneſſe is begunne and increaſed euen in our *bodyes*, by the vertue of his Death and reſurrection apprehended & applyed by faith. 3 Our *bodyes* now haue aſſurance of a glorious reſurrection through his death and reſurrection. 4. Our *bodyes* are made the true owners of our bodily food, clothing, ritches, and other comforts, whereof the Wicked are but vſurpers. Yet you will ſay, *Wee dye ſtill, as well as the Infidels.*

† *Yea ſo farre forth a proportion was held in all reſpecte as the poſſibilitie of thinges could admit: as anon after is further ſhewed* pag. 26. 27.

What good our very Bodyes haue by Chriſtes death.

The ſcripture ſaieth *Nay*: if you meane Death *the curſe of the lawe* and *the puniſhment of ſinne*, *He was made ſinne for vs*, that is, *He* tooke the puniſhmẽt of ſinne for vs. And *Chriſt redeemed vs from the curſe of the Lawe, being made a Curſe for vs.* 5. Therefore death, yea bodily death, as it is *the ſtipend of ſinne*, as the puniſhment of ſinne, So * *Hee* hath taken it from vs, and vs from it, and *we* are freed by *his death*: yea vnto vs it is nowe cleane changed, & not the ſame in it own nature as it was. It is to vs the paſſinge to heauen, and a thinge to bee prayed for. whiche the puniſhment of ſinne can not be. *I deſire to be diſſolued and to bee with Chriſte*, ſayeth the Apoſtle. And therefore the ſcripture taketh the name of *death* from this departure of the godly: *He that beleeueth in me ſhall not ſee death: and hee hath nowe paſſed from death to life.* Thus then, haue not *our bodyes* any good at all, any more thẽ the bodyes *of infidels*? God forbid: This is a moſte vnchriſtian ſpeech. Laſtly to anſwere to the former reaſon directlie. It is ſaid, *If Chriſtes bodily death ſatisfie not for the ſinne of our ſoules, then haue we no good by it.* Firſt let vs know diſtinctlie what is meant here by *Chriſtes bodily death*. Wee meane his *meere* bodily death, and that ſay we, beeing but a parte of his moſte meritorious paſſion ſatisfied not for our ſinnes. The *whole* aboũdantlie ſatisfied, no one *parte* or piece thereof doeth ſatisfie: becauſe *what GOD*

* The proper puniſhmẽt for ſinne is not layd vpõ two: not vpon Chriſt, and vs alſo.

3

hath

hath ioyned togither, let no man ſo wickedlie ſe-parate.

But you will replie, his *onely* blood ſhed, his bodily death *meerely* was ſufficient, yea *one drop* of his blood, beeing the blood of the ſonne of God, was ſufficiēt to redeeme a thouſande worldes.

That we denie: howbeit we reaſon not what it might haue bene, if GOD had ſo appointed: we ſpeake not thereof. We ſay onely what it was, and is. That only *is ſufficient* in deed, which God hath appointed to ſuffice for the ſatisfaction of our ſinns. God hath appointed *both the ſufferings of his ſoule and alſo of his body*. Likewiſe all thoſe ſufferinges *in his liſe*, aſwell as *at his death*. Therefore *all theſe ioīctlie are ſufficient*, but *no parte of them ſeuerallie*. So that † to ſaye *one drop only* of Chriſtes bloud *was* ſimply ſufficient for all our ſinnes: I holde it a preſumptuous & vngodly ſpeech, whiche ſo mainlie croſſeth the appointmēt of God, and his reuealed will. As is partlie before declared, and ſhalbe hereafter more fully. Further it doeth flatlie croſſe the moſte perfect *iuſtice* and the *loue* of God: both which together, that is, *iuſtice with loue*, and *loue with iuſtice* muſt needes ſtand intire & ſounde, and not a whitt impayred in the myſterie of our redemption. 1. *Iuſtice* requireth that the ſame nature ſhoulde ſatisfie for ſinne, whiche properly committed the ſin. But our ſoule properlie, chiefflie

† One onely drop of Chriſtes bloud in deed not ſufficient for the redemption of the world.

lie, and immediatlie ſinned. Therefore Chriſtes Soule ſhould properlie, chieflie, and immediatlie paye the price thereof.

Note. 2. It is not proportionable with *Iuſtice*, that an eaſier puniſhment ſhould ſatisfie for a greater ſinne, where it is poſſible that it may bee had. But the Soule of Chriſt poſſibly might haue ſuffered *properlie* and *immediatlie*. Therefore *in iuſtice* it muſt and did ſuffer, and not his bodye onely.

Obiect. If anie ſaye, Chriſtes *verie bodilie* ſufferinges were ſo grieuous and vehement, as that they were comparable to the Soules ſufferinges, if it had *properlie* indured any.

Anſwer. Nay, that hath no reaſon: the *fleſh* is not capable, neither of like righteouſnes nor ſinne, neither of ſuch ioyes nor puniſhements according to the capacitie of the *ſoule:* there is no equall meaſure betweene theſe. Nowe this priſe equally in *iuſtice* muſt be kept ſo farre as it is poſſible in all ſatisfactions. Therfore here in this it was kept: and how in this it was kept in deed, we ſhall more cleerely perceiue in the other more *ſpeciall arguments* hereafter following. Therfore it behoued Chriſtes ſoule to ſuffer for vs *properlie*, aſwell as his body.

Obiect. If any ſay, It was Gods ſingular *loue* to his moſt deare ſõne to quit him of thoſe extremeſt torments *the ſuffrings of his ſoule*, and to admit a *Diſpẽſation* in ſteed of *Cõpenſation*, that is to be ſatisfied with leſſe then God might haue exacted of Chriſt, & leſſe then

he

he could haue yeelded. 1. This belonges properly to the ſifting of our more *ſpecial arguments* hereafter, where we ſhall ſee into it further. 2. Gods *loue* muſt not impaire his *iuſtice*, but both muſt ſtande intire and perfect togither in our redemption, as is aboue ſaid, or elswe deſtroy the nature of God. But by this deuiſe gods *iuſtice* which might be executed by Chriſts ſuffering in his ſoule, ſhrinketh, and is ſhortned not a litle, by reaſon of *his loue* to Chriſt which inflicteth not al the puniſhmēt (ſay they) which being due to our ſins, Chriſt alſo as man might feele, & his Father might laye vpon him. Nay this, in this caſe is no *loue* but *partialtie*. But † this is the *loue of God* in this myſterie, euē that which he ſheweth vnto *vs*, his *iuſtice* being layd vpon Chriſt. I ſay his *loue* is to vs: in that he hath tranſlated our guiltines frō *vs* vpon Chriſt his own ſonnes perſon, & beaten *our* fault vpō *his* back. This is the moſt gracious & heauenly *loue* of God to be bleſſed & magnified for euer: & not that he ſpared his ſonn in paying our ranſome more thē the poſſibilitie of *iuſtice* would that he ſhould. For ſo *a leſſe and a farre lighter humiliatiō* of Chriſt then his bodily death alſo, might as well haue ſatisfied God for vs. I ſay, what needed thoſe moſte pitiefull and wofull bodily woundes, & ſmarting ſtripes, ſomuch bloodſhed being ſo precious, yea that vndeſerued ſundring of *body* & *ſoule* by cruell death? Nay more then this, what neded al thoſe

Anſwere.

† *Gods loue in orderyninge Chriſtes ſuffe-rings, what it is in truethe.*

thoſe penuries, ignominies, perſecutions and other miſeries in his life time, which he plenteouſlie ſuſteined? When as ſome one or fewe ſuch as Chriſt ſuffred, yea his incarnation only might haue bin enough & enough meritorious in that diuine perſon to appeaſe his fathers wrath, if in his fatherlie *loue* he meant to *diſpenſe* and laye leſſe then the ful waight & burden of our ſinnes on him. All thoſe * ſuperfluities of ſufferinges which Chriſt did moſt painfullie endure, howe ſtande they with this infinite loue of God towardes his moſte deare and tenderly beloued ſonne, if they needed not at all, if this his *loue* might *diſpenſe* with his *iuſtice*? We can neuer auoyd this abſurde and irreligious conſequent.

*Yea: Neither the Loue nor Iuſtice of God could lay more on Chriſte then was ſufficient. But God laide more on him then the ſheading of one drop of bloud: Therfore one drop was not ſufficient.

Obiection.

Now then will you reply and ſay, Thus wee doe make the *meere* bodily death and bloodſhead of Chriſt not profitable, nor meritorious, if we will not yeeld them to ſatisfie for ſinne. That is vntrue: We know and profeſſe they are *moſt profitable* and *meritorious*, yea leſſer ſufferings then thoſe, as his *pouertie*, his *hatred*, his *ſhame*, and *ignominie*, *&c.* theſe were *all moſt profitable* and *meritorious* and *ſatisfactorie* alſo to our ſaluatiō. But as an Armie of ſouldiours doe *all together* gette the victorie and not any one of them aſunder, and yet for all that *each* one ſingly is profitable in fight for the attainment of victorie: euen ſo theſe Suffrings of Chriſt both of his body and of his ſoule

Answere.

all

all together do ſufficientlie merite, but *each one* in ſeuerall is profitable and helpeth therevnto.

To theſe prooſes before handled, let vs adde one or two more briefly in this wiſe. 4.

If Christ were emptyed & abaſed to the vttermoſt that might be, then he was afflicted in his ſoule properlie and immediatlie as well as in his bodye. But he was in deed emptied and abaſed, exinanited, to the vtmoſt that might be. Therefore he was afflicted properly and immediatlie, yea moſt bitterly in his ſoule. Where this worde in the Apoſtle, he †*emptied him ſelfe*, doth teſtifie, he was ſo farre caſt downe in his humiliation, that he was *cleane voyde* of all comfort and dignitie, before his exaltation to ioy & glorie: Which by no meanes can be poſſiblie true in plaines of ſpeech, (that *he was emptyed*) if the *ſoule* were vntouched, and felte not ſuch humiliatiō at Gods hand whereof it was properlie capable. And as for an *hyperbole* or phraſe larger thē the meaning is in this place, ther is no cauſe for any to dreame thereof.

† *Heauton ekenōsen.* *Phil. 2. 7.*

Againe thus I reaſon: *He Offered him ſelfe thorough the Eternall Spirit*. What ſignifieth *Him ſelfe* here but his whole Humanitie, euen his *body* and *ſoule*, to bee the Sacrifice of redemption which hee *offered* to GOD *through* the vertue of his *Deitie*? Therefore ſeing his *ſoule* alſo was the *ſacrifice*, his *ſoule ſuffered* alſo as well as his body. 5. Hebr. 9. 14.

Laſtly, *If both the body & ſoule of Christ were* 6.

the

the Tabernacle of his Deitie wherein hee perfor-med his ſacrifice for ſinne, Then hee ſuffered pro-perly as well in his ſoule as in his body.

* Heb. 8. & 9. Col. 2. 9.

But the Tabernacle of Chriſtes Deitie wherein hee performed his ſacrifice, was both * *his ſoule and body. Therefore hee ſuffered properly both in ſoule and in body.*

Where we haue to cõſider theſe points: 1. Touchinge the *Iewiſh Tabernacle*, Moſes ſheweth that the typicall Prieſtes offered vp therin their ſacrifices for recõciliation to God. 2. Chriſtes *manhood* is * called by the holy ghoſt the Tabernacle of his god-head: that is, he maketh it anſwerable in Chriſt in trueth to the typicall Taberna-cle, wherin the Iewiſh prieſthood ſacrifi-ced. 3. His *manhood* here is meant his *whole* & intire manhood, not any one part ther-of, but both *his ſoule and body* iointly, & the ſame to be † this *Tabernacle* of his Deitie, * *wherin the Godhead dwelt bodily*. 4. That Chriſt offred vp his ſacrifice of redemptiõ in *this Tabernacle*, ỳ is, in his *whol* & intire mãhood

* Heb. 8. 2. and 9. 11.

† Heb. 9. 11.

* Col. 2. 9.

So that hence our reaſon is good: If all theſe poincts be true, & if Chriſt thus of-fred his ſacrifice for ſin both in his ſoule and body, then he ſuffered *properly* both in his ſoule & body, & not in one part only. But al theſe points are true, as our *aſſump-tion* importeth, and are manifeſtly proued by *Cõparing* Moſes inſtitution of that Iew-iſh Tabernacle with this ſpirituall appli-cation thereof, not to the fleſh onelie

but

but to the †*whole* humanitie of Christ. †Heb.8.& 9.

Therfore the Conclusion is firme: Neither can any thing be stood at vnles some will saye, Christes flesh onely and not his Soule also is the *true Tabernacle* of the Godhead. Which amongst all wise Christians is to absurde.

Yet that of the Apostle is alleadged & obiected earnestly: **God forbid that I should reioyce but in the Crosse of Christ Iesus.* Here euē all and the whole Sufferings of Christ are signified, for in nothing els would Paule reioice, but euē herein. Howbeit the *Crosse* conteyneth not any sufferings of Christs Soule, his Soule was not crucified but his Body onely. Therefore his Body onely suffered, and not his Soule. I answere, It is true, this is not only an obiection, but euen a foundation and principall ground of this errour: but so mistaken & forced, as nothing may be more. So that by ouerthrowing this, the whole Conclusion will fail. 1. If Paul had here meant the very *personall* sufferinges of Christ, why might not *the Crosse* conteyne his Soules sufferinges, yea al the Suffrings of Christs whole life? What letteth but his Soule might be sayd to be Crucified, & not the Flesh only? Any bitter anguish & sharp affliction is commonly called, a Crosse. And though *Christs Crosse* properly & strictly taken was, sensible & outward in deed, yet who seeth not but it is most familiarly & often vsed in a larger

Obiection. * Gal.6,14

Answer.

larger meaning, to conteyne all Christes grieuous Sufferinges what so euer, when so euer, & how so euer: euen like as is obserued before † against the first obiection against vs in the beginninge. 2. Neuertheles I take it to be cleare, that this Text is further mistaken. The Apostle heere speaketh not of the *personall* sufferinges of Christ, but of the godly, Christs members: which they suffer for Christs trueth sake, which are also called **the afflictions of Christ.* For hauing a litle †before noted the False teachers, whiche mingled and corrupted Gods trueth, because so they might better scape *persecution*, which they were loth to suffer *for the Crosse of Christe*, that is, for the sincere doctrine whiche commonlie *bringeth the Crosse with it: Now †here he presentlie Opposeth his owne vpright and faithfull affection, sayinge, Nay, *God forbid, that we* who are the true Ministers of God, *should ioy in* anie thing *but in* this that these men doe abhorre, that is, euen *in afflictions for Christ* and for his sincere trueth, when God calleth vs therevnto: Whiche in deed is a singular *note of the true Ministers of God. Also that which followeth doeth shew it further: for here by nothing but the † *old man is Crucified* in him, & dyeth more & more, and he groweth and increaseth forward in being *a new creature*, which verely is all in all. Here then is no occasion to speake precisely of the *personall*

† pag. 8. 9.

*Col. 1. 24.

†Gal. 6. 12.

*Crux comes Euangely.

† Gal. 6. 14.

* Act. 5. 41.

† Gal. 6. 15, 16. The world is crucified, &c

all ſuffrings of Chriſt but he ſpeaketh of Chriſts ſufferings in his Members. Wherfore this is cleane miſtaken.

Thus we ſee hitherto nothing letteth, but our *Generall Reaſon* is euident by the Scripture, *That Chriſt ſuffered properly & immedeatly in his ſoule:* and conſequentlie *the Wrath of God for ſinne*. Nowe it remayneth that we proceede to the reſt of our *Argumentes* for this point.

The more *Speciall Reaſons* prooving that Chriſt ſuffered for vs *the Wrath of God*, and euen ſo *the paynes of Hell or Helliſh ſorrowes*, are nowe here to be next conſidered.

More *Speciall reaſons*, that Chriſt ſuffered the wrath of God.

But firſt it is good to mark theſe names *Hell* & *Helliſh ſorrowes*. Becauſe all the aduãtage is picked againſt this moſt chriſtian & cõfortable doctrine by them that lone cõtention, only through the ambiguity & doubtfulnes of this word *Hell*. We meane not that Chriſt ſuffred *Hell* properlie, that is hell torments in the verie place & condition of the damned. God fordid. This groſſe cogitation neuer came into our mindes, but only he ſuffred for our ſinnes Gods *ſeuere Wrath and iuſt Vengeance*, or rather *the very Effects* of his iuſt wrath & vengeance: which we affirme is equal to Hell it ſelfe and all the tormentes thereof in ſharpnes and vehemencie of payne. And thus we ſay *Chriſt ſuffered Hell or Helliſh ſorrowes* for vs, and no otherwiſe. Which vve proue by many reaſons.

What *is meant by Chriſtes ſuffering of Hell, or Helliſh ſorrowes.*

1. First thus: *We should haue suffred such paines as are the effectes of the intollerable wrath of God for our sinne. But Christ suffred the sorrowes & payne for sinne which we should. Therfore Christ suffred for vs such sorrowes & paynes, as are the effectes of the intollerable wrath of God for sin.* The *assumption* only can be doubted. But the prophet *Esay* affirmeth it in playn words: *He bare our iniquities, and sustayned our sorrowes.* He sayeth not only, He sustayned sorrowes, but he sustayned *Our* sorrowes: yea the text hath it more significantlie. *He sustayned* † *our very sorrowes*, or *our sorrowes thē selues*, that is, those which els we should haue borne. This cōclusion can no wayes be auoyded.

† *Macobhēnu sobhalam.*

* 2. Tim. 2. 6. † *Antilytron hyper pantōn.*

The like to this is proued * *He gaue himselfe* † *a price of redemption for vs, which wee* els should haue payed. For note that *antilytron* is the price which whē a Captiue can not him self pay, then his Prince or some other friend payes it for him, to redeeme him withall. Now the custome and vse is, we know, that the enimy taketh the same price for his Captiue of an other, which he would take els of the Captiue him self, if he were able to pay it. Euen so the scripture here speaking after the commō vse and custome of redeeming Captiues takē in warre, doeth meane that Christes *price of redemptiō* which he payed for vs, was the same which els we should haue payed.

2. * Gal. 3. 13. Secondly I proue it thus: * *Christ redeemed vs frō the curse of the Lawe, when he was made a Curse*

Curſe for vs. What *curſe* was he made for vs? It is opened ver. 10. That *curſe* which is cõpriſed in *Moſes: *Curſed is euery man that continueth not in all things written in the Law to doe them*. And more particularly in this verie verſe it is called *the Curſe of the Lawe*. What is that? Surely the feeling of Gods wrath for the trãſgreſſion of the Law. This *curſe* therfore ſaith Paule *Chriſt was made for vs*: ỳ is, he ſuſteyned for vs euen the feeling of Gods wrath for our trãſgreſſions imputed to him. If any thinke, this *curſe* here which Chriſt was made, is not the ſame *curſe* whiche is here called *the curſe of the law*, and is deſcribed in the wordes of *Deut*: *Curſed is euery one, &c*. But this to be another curſe, a leſſer & lighter, which Chriſt is here affirmed to be made for vs. It is vaine and ſenſeles to think the Apoſtle here ſpeakes of two ſeuerall kinds of curſes: the cohærẽce ſheweth that he ſpeaketh & treateth all of one maner of *curſe*. And if Chriſt ſuſteyned any *curſe* for vs, what *curſe* could it be? Not the *curſe of the Law*? or what was it? Not the *curſe* of God? If it were, then that is it which wee ſpeake of, and vvhich els vve ſhould haue borne.

* Deut. 27. 26.

† Gal. 3. 13.

Obiection.

Anſwere

If it be ſaid, It cãnot be that Chriſt bare our *curſe*, or paid the price ỳ we els ſhould haue paid, or ſuſteined *the very ſorrowes* that we ſhould haue ſuſteined: for thẽ he muſt haue ſuffred perpetually as the dãned do, & as we ſhould to, had we not bin redeemed by Chriſt.

Obiection.

Answere.

I answere. 1. The scripture it selfe affirmeth, Hee did all that for vs: Therefore who dareth denie it? Who either man or Angel shall presume to say, Nay? 2. This followeth not (if wee note well) this maketh not at all, that therefore Christ suffered *perpetually*, if he suffered our punishment and had the iust sentence of our cõdemnation (I meane *the full sharpnes and vehemencie of it*) translated & executed vpon him. That which he suffered might be for ỹ time *incomparably sharpe and terrible*, though induring but a while and not perpetuall. Wherefore this must be noted, we cõpare not the sufferinges of Christ for vs with the paynes of the Damned in regarde of *continuance:* therein we neuer doubted not any Christian, but that Christ suffered lesser, that is shorter time then we should, & the damned doe. If anie aske howe maye this be, if *Gods iustice* must stande? We answere. Yes: it may bee, because his perpetuall sufferinges needed not. The infinite excellẽcie of his person that suffered, being the Sonne of God, countervayleth in merit and worthines the infinit continuance of punishmẽt, which els he should, but now needed not to indure. 2 Because this abridgment & shortning of the time needes must be. I say it must needes haue bene so: because simply it was impossible to be otherwise. Which is most certen for two causes: 1. No flesh els could possiblie haue

In sharpnesse Christ suffered as the Damned doe, but not in continuance of sorrow.

Obiection.

Answer.

It was simply impossible that Christ should suffer perpetually: for 2. reasons. 1.

haue bene saued, vnlesse the Sauiour and redeemer had ended his payment for vs. But God had decreed to saue some, whom he gaue his sonne to suffer for. Therfore it was impossible absolutly, but our Sauiours payment must end. 2. He was verie God himself that suffered: therfore it was simply impossible, but he must ouercome, and finish, and obteine his purchase. Thus then in this one point of *continuance* in punishment our Sauiour satisfied Gods *iustice*, not by suffering strictlie and exactlie that which wee should, but by suffering ỳ which in his person was fully worth & answerable to ỳ perpetual cõtinuance therof, which in vs els should haue ben done. And al because of the simple necessity for which it must be so. If any ask, why were not Christs paines also lessened as well as ỳ perpetuitie abridged, by the infinit merit of his person. I answere, Because there was no impossibilitie, no necessitie, no neede, but he might feele *the full smart* of our sinnes, as there was, for him not to feele *the full continuance* thereof. Seeing therefore it was possible for him to feele all our *smart*, and seeing Gods strict *iustice* requireth it so, therefore it was so, and it must be so. He suffered for vs *the full smart* of our sinnes, which els wee should haue suffered both in soule and body. 2. Obiect. Answer.

Christ felt the Curse of God vpon for vs.

I vrge then, Let it be here noted, Christ is said to be *made a curse for vs*: then he felt this

Answere.

I answere. 1. The scripture it selfe affirmeth, Hee did all that for vs: Therefore who dareth denie it? Who either man or Angel shall presume to say, Nay? 2. This followeth not (if wee note well) this maketh not at all, that therefore Christ suffered *perpetually*, if he suffered our punishment and had the iust sentence of our cõdemnation (I meane *the full sharpnes and vehemencie of it*) translated & executed vpon him. That which he suffered might be for y time *incomparably sharpe and terrible*, though induring but a while and not perpetuall. Wherefore this must be noted, we cõpare not the sufferinges of Christ for vs with the paynes of the Damned in regarde of *continuance:* therein we neuer doubted not any Christian, but that Christ suffered lesser, that is shorter time then we should, & the damned doe. If anie aske howe maye this be, if *Gods iustice* must stande? We answere. Yes: it may bee, because his perpetuall sufferinges needed not. The infinite excellẽcie of his person that suffered, being the Sonne of God, countervayleth in merit and worthines the infinit continuance of punishmẽt, which els he should, but now needed not to indure. 2 Because this abridgment & shortning of the time needes must be. I say it must needes haue bene so: because simply it was impossible to be otherwise. Which is most certen for two causes: 1. No flesh els could possiblie haue

In sharpnesse Christ suffered as the Damned doe, but not in continuance of sorrow.

Obiection.

Answer.

It was simply impossible that Christ should suffer perpetually: for 2. reasons. 1.

haue bene ſaued, vnleſſe the Sauiour and redeemer had ended his payment for vs. But God had decreed to ſaue ſome, whom he gaue his ſonne to ſuffer for. Therfore it was impoſſible abſolutly, but our Sauiours payment muſt end. 2. He was verie God himſelf that ſuffered: therfore it was ſimply impoſſible, but he muſt ouercome, and finiſh, and obteine his purchaſe. Thus then in this one point of *continuance* in puniſhment our Sauiour ſatisfied Gods *iuſtice*, not by ſuffering ſtrictlie and exactlie that which wee ſhould, but by ſuffering ỹ which in his perſon was fullyworth & anſwerable to ỹ perpetual cõtinuance therof, which in vs els ſhould haue ben done. And al becauſe of the ſimple neceſſity for which it muſt be ſo. If any ask, why were not Chriſts paines alſo leſſened as well as ỹ perpetuitie abridged, by the infinit merit of his perſon. I anſwere, Becauſe there was no impoſſibilitie, no neceſſitie, no neede, but he might feele *the full ſmart* of our ſinnes, as there was, for him not to feele *the full continuance* thereof. Seeing therefore it was poſſible for him to feele all our *ſmart*, and ſeeing Gods ſtrict *iuſtice* requireth it ſo, therefore it was ſo, and it muſt be ſo. He ſuffered for vs *the full ſmart* of our ſinnes, which els wee ſhould haue ſuffered both in ſoule and body. 2.

Obiect.

Anſwer.

Chriſt felt the Curſe of God vpon for him vs.

I vrge then, Let it be here noted, Chriſt is ſaid to be *made a curſe for vs*: then he felt

this *curse*. And before I shewed this *curse* was *Gods curse*: and what is that, but *Gods wrath* for sinne. So then Christ is heere proued to haue *felt Gods wrath for sinne*.

Obiection. If you replie: This *curse* is not *Gods curse*, nor his vvrath for sinne: but only a shame and ignominy amongest men for his bodilie hanging on the tree: it vvas an ignominious death, and that was all which is here meant, because *euery one* els is not cursed by God, that is openly executed: as here

Answere. the Apostle expressly hath it. I answere, 1. It is more then absurd to saye, The *curse* heere which Christ bare for vs, was only & meerely but the opinion of the people, holding it a sham to be executed to death openly. Will any man of common reason say, that this is all *the curse* that Christ bare for vs, or that here is meant? Nothing but ỹ thame of the world? and no other thing betwene God & him? To name this opi-

Obiection. nion is cõfutatiõ enough. Further where your reason is, Because *euery one* is saide to

Answere. be cursed *which hangeth on the tree*. Knovve you that the meaning is, *Euery one that* so *hangeth* by the iust sentence of the Lawe: wherefore it is heere called *the curse of the lawe*. Nowe then not euery one that is hanged is cursed: for many innocentes & martyrs *are hanged*, who are most blessed. But euerie one that is iustly hanged, is cursed. And so vvas Christ heere. You will

will aske: What, vvas Christ *iustly* hanged on the tree? Yea verily, *by the iust sentence of the Law* vvas he put to death: neither let this be strange to any Christian. Is not *the Suretie* by the iust sentence of the Lavve condemned to pay his debt, for whom he hath vvillingly & aduisedly vndertaken? Is it wronge, is it violence for the Lawe to lay the penaltie on the *Suretie*, when the debtor can not discharge it? But if it bee meere and true Iustice, and no vvronge, then was Christ *by the iust sentence of the Law* hanged on the tree, & so he bare in deed the true *Curse of the Lawe*. Not in respect that he was an innocent man, nor as the Iewes Magistrates had to doe with him, for so they did him most foule wronge that Crucified him: but as he took on him our *person*, as he was *made sinne* for vs, and as he stood forth in our name to aunsvvere Gods iustice, So was the *iust* sentence of our condemnation according to the iustice of the Lavve inflicted on him, albeit the Ievves savve it not.

Howe Christ was in our person iustly cursed of God and executed for vs.

Some vvill saye, This *Curse* heere vvas only bodily: For so it is proued by † those vvordes of the Lawe, that speake only of a bodily executiō. So it may aswell be cōcluded, That the *Psal. proueth not Christes taking of a perfect body, but only of a Mans *eares*, because there is mention of no more; *Eares thou hast prepared me.*

Obiection.

†*He that hangeth on a tree.*

Answere.

*Psal. 40. 6.

Heb. 10. 5. Yet the *holy Ghost sheweth therby that he had a perfect *body*, *A body thou hast ordayned me:* yea in deed both *a body* and *a soule.* Therfore both here and there & in many other such like places the Scripture noteth *a part for the whole:* and so heere in our text *a parte* of the iust curse of the Lawe, thereby meaning the *whole:* that is, *hanging on the tree* for *the whole executiō* of the Lawes sentence against sin. For this bodily *Hanging* was a part of the Lawes Curse: & the *Soules* suffring is also by the Curse of the Lawe as well as this of the body, and conteyneth the feeling of Gods wrath too, as well as the simple Dying, the dissolution of the soule from the body: and is it selfe † the wages of sinne no lesse, yea more in deed, then the bodily death, though the bodily death be also. The which meaning is here easie & necessarie to be gathered, seeing such a terme is giuen to this *hāging on the tree* which cōpriseth the whole effect of al that I say, which also the holy Ghost sayeth, He was *Cursed* by it, yea *made a curse.* What doeth this els but signifie the wrath of God, the curse of God felt by him that was so hāged, as is aboue shewed: yea felt in his soule, seeinge this alwayes lighteth more properly on the Soule then on the Body. Therefore this *hanging* is here set as *a part for the whole* execution of Gods iust Curse, & argueth the whole to be on him that was executed, that is on Christ.

† Rom. 5. 12. & 6. 23. Gen. 3. 3.

If

If it bee obiected, It is not possible that Obiect.
Christ the most holy and obedient sonne, the most perfectly beloued of God, yea personally one with God himselfe, that he in his Soule could feele Gods wrath. It is not possible, but God must hate him on whom his wrath lighted, and in him must be found a conscience of sinne, but *Christ knew no sinne, neither in his mouth was found anie guile.* And speciallie he, who God is wroth withall, can not be *one person with God* himselfe. Seeing then a twofolde separation followeth, 1 of the Deitie from the Humanitie, 2 of Gods loue and protection from Christ, and nothing remayneth but hatred, horrour of conscience, and vtter darknes vpon him, if he felt *Gods wrath & hellish tormentes:* Therefore it is *absurd, impious, hareticall and blasphemous* so to holde and maintaine.

God defend: *This curse causeles shall not come.* Answer.
But rather the contrarie saying wil proue such: For *they digge a pit for others and fall into it themselues.* But I answer, howe could * Death possesse the *body* of Christe three dayes yea howe could his *body* here be accursed and *made a Curse*, which is a thing confessed? And yet I hope all this whyle his body was not *separated* from his Godhead personally: euen so neither was his *soule*, neither need it to be disioyned from the Godhead, when it was *accursed* for vs, and susteyned *Gods wrath.* And as the very

* *The wages of sinne.*

body

body of Christ was then not hated of God neither out of his protection for all that extreame humiliation: Euen so neither was his *soule*. Therfore God alwayes loued Christ, he alwayes imbraced him, hee always was knit to him in regard of his own innocent person: and yet wee may say in another regard, that is of *our person* which he susteyned being all sinfull and rebellious, God cursed him, God hated him, God punished him iustly, or rather our sinne vpon him, til by his sacrifice accomplished, he tooke it all away. So then we must well note, in Christ were *two persons* or conditions. 1. his own, wherin he was most holy, most innocent, most beloued, most blessed. 2. Hee tooke *our person* on him, and presented himselfe therein before his Father, and so he became by our sinnes, sinfull, defiled, hatefull, and accursed. *The Surety* though he bee vtterly cleere and obnoxious to none, yet by his *suretyship* hee is a debtor and obnoxious to the Creditour & the Law. If *a tender ladyes* only child should by some casualtie be all tombled in blood, or mire, & most stincking filth: The child so berayed and lothsome would breed greate abhorring and lothing in the delicate eyes of the dainty lady: yet the childs own *person* should be neuer the lesse beloued of the mother, but rather the more if it may bee. So such

In Christ were 2 estates or conditions, or he sustayned 2 persons: ours, and his owne.

ſuch *two perſons* or conditions are found in Chriſt: according to one hee was alwayes beloued, according to the other which he tooke vpon him (whilſt hee had not finiſhed that office) hee was *iuſtly* accurſed. And if we ſee not how this may be in his *ſoule*, conſider howe it was in his body, (which neither is nor can be denyed) and then it will appeare howe his *ſoule* alſo might ſuſteyne for vs the *curſe* of God, and yet no *ſeparation* to follow.

But ſome will ſay: this *curſe* here is nothing els but ſimply to dye, the diſſoluti-on of the body and ſoule: which the *ſcripture ſaith is *a curſe* in deed: [*In the day that thou ſhalt eate of the forbidden fruite thou ſhalt dye the death.*] Nowe this death befalleth to the deereſt children of God ſtill: that is, to dye. Therefore they alſo beare this curſe though they bee cleere from the vengance and wrath of God. Euen ſo and no otherwiſe is Chriſt heere ſaide to be accurſed, only becauſe he dyed. Obiect. * Gen. 3. 3.

Heere wee deny that the death of the righteous is properly a *curſe* or a puniſhment for ſinne. For ſo the Godly are forgiuen the *fault* but not the *puniſhment* of ſinne. Which is one of the Popiſh hereſies. †Therefore *death* in the Godly is not properly a puniſhement of ſin, nor properlie a curſe of the Lawe. Indeed in it ſelfe and of it owne nature it is ſo, as it was firſt inflicted by the reuenger of ſinne Anſwer. Note. † See alſo pag. 24.

ſinne for ſinne: but in the godly & faith
full childe of God it is not ſo: the natur
and propertie of it is cleane changed it
plainly a good thing and to be deſired, a
Paule ſayeth, *Death is to me a gaine: I deſire to
diſſolued & to be with Chriſt.* Which he ough
not to ſaye if *death* were properly a curſ
to him. And Chriſt ſayeth ſuch men *ſha
not dye, but paſſe from death to life.* Where he
denyeth flatlie the name of *Death* vnto it
euen becauſe the nature of it is change
to the godly. Neither cā it be ſtrange tha
the ſelfe ſame thing may be cleane chan-
ged & of a diuers nature in diuers perſōs.
To kil a mans ſelf, in *Achitophel*, was a foul
and monſtruous ſinne: but in *Sampſon* it
was a moſt glorious vertue, when he pul-
led the houſe vpon his owne and the *Phi-
liſtims* heades. Here the ſelfe ſame act *To
kill ones ſelfe* is of a diuers nature in diuers
men, good in *Sampſon*, but moſt wicked in
Achitophell. And euen as ſome *Phyſike* in a
ſound mans ſtomach is poyſon, which in
a ſicke man is medicinable: and riches to
the wicked are vniuſt poſſeſſions increa-
ſing their iudgement, but to the godly
they are true bleſſings. So the ſelfe ſame
thing in diuers perſons may be cleane of
diuers and contrary natures. And euen ſo
death is to the wicked a curſe for ſin: yet
to the godly it is not *death*, but *a paſſage to
life*: no *Curſe* properly, nor puniſhment of
ſinne, but *a benefit and aduantage*. Therefore
Chriſtes

Christes *dyeng* simply as the godly dye, may in no sorte heere be called *a curse*, or *cursed*. But seeing the text sayeth, *Hee was made a Curse for vs*, or accursed in his death: Therefore he *dyed* not simply as the godly dye, *He* indured *the Curse* and wrath of God truely.

I proceed nowe to another prose Col. 2. 15. Christ *on the crosse spoyled principalities and powers, and made a shewe of them openly, triumphing ouer them.* These *principalities* are the *Diuells* and powers of darknes: the instruments of Gods iustice & wrath, the tempters which assault & *wrastle with al good men. Euen so heere they assault and conflict with Christ whom they did chiefly desire to ouerthrow, being the head of all the rest: but here is shewed his glorious *victory* and conquest vpon them. Therfore it is certaine they *on the Crosse* moste furiously attempted him, & he felt them, that is to say, the very instrumentes that wrought the very effectes of Gods seueritie and wrath vpon him: but he at the last most gloriously conquered them & trode them vnder † feete in that place. If any doubt that these wordes are not to be referred to the *crosse* of Christ, it shalbe made most manifest that they are, and vndenyable (God willing) in *the next question.*

3.

Eph. 6. 12. 16

† *Heere some say, that Christ payed the price and did satisfaction to the Diuill properlie, and not to God. But it can not want both absurdity and impietie so to say. Hee payed it to Gods iustice, to his holy seuerity, whereof the Diuell was but executioner.*

Further this reason will proove the same, taken from *the lesse to the more.* The members of Christ doe *wrastle with the powers

4.

The Godly sometime taste of Hellish sorrowes in this life.

*Eph. 6. 12, 16

powers of darknes, and indure the fyrie dartes of the Diuell. And Iob cryeth out * *The arrowes of the Almightie are in me, the venome whereof doe drinke vp my spirit, and the terrours of God fight against me.* The like terrours doeth † *Ionas* seme to feele in the fishes belly. When hee *cryed to the Lorde out of the bottome of hell.* And *Dauid* wanted not the like in his manifolde and fearefull agonies manie times. Thus doe the members of Christ suffer. Therefore of necessitie Christ our Heade suffered the like: yea much rather, and farre greater terrours of GOD, and assaultes of the Diuell. For therein haue we * *conformitie* with him, euen in all kindes of sufferinges. Therefore in sufferinges Christ Iesus hath matched vs at least, yea surelie hath gonne beyonde vs. This is the † *Cuppe* and the *Baptisme* which Christ affirmed should be common with his Disciples and him selfe, though hee dronke this Cup deeper then any els. And it is saide, * He was *like vs in all pointes*, then he was like vs in sufferings, and specially in the mainest sufferinges, which are the terrours and the wrath of God, which as is proued, the godly are not exempted from in this life, and yet neuer are, nor can be touched deeper, then was Christ. Yea further, in these places to the Hebrewes hee sheweth a reason which can neuer be refuted by the witt of man. *Hee*

* Iob. 6. 4.

† Ion. 2. 2.

* Rom. 8. 29.

† Math. 20. 23

* Heb. 4. 15. and 2. 17.

succou-

succoured vs not, but wherein he hath had experience of our temptations and infirmities. But hee succoureth vs euen in these our temptations of feeling the terrours of God and the sorrowes of Hell. Therefore he him selfe had experience of the same. This heere the very Scripture sayeth: *Wherefore in all thinges it behooued him, or he ought to be made like vnto his Brethren, that hee might bee mercifull and a faithfull high priest in thinges concerning God.* Loe, he was made *like vs*, that he might be *mercifull and faithfull* towardes vs. † Heb. 2. 17, 18.

Againe *hothen ophile.* Wherfore he ought, it behoued him so to be. Therefore hee could not haue bene *mercifull and faithfull* to vs, vnlesse hee had bene *like vs.* Which also more fully appeareth in the wordes most significant followinge, *En hó gar peponthen autos peirastheis, dynatai tois peirazomenois boethesai:* For in that which him selfe suffered and vvas tempted in, hee is able to succour them that are tempted: or that are (*so*) tempted. Here he giueth the reason *why hee succoureth vs beeing tempted*, because *him selfe also hath likewise suffered.* Also he sayeth, *thereby* Christ is able to succour vs: as if els hee had not bene able to bee rightlie mercifull. And heere me thinkes *en hó* hath a singular force more then is commonlie obserued: Euen to note the particular matter *wherein* Christ is able to succour, namely *in that which him selfe hath suffered* before.

So

So that if Christ haue not suffered it, o
the like, then he is not able to succour v
in such sufferinges and temptations. Fo
surely otherwise he can not say heere a
he doth, that Christ was made *like* his bre
thren in temptations and sufferings. An
all this he sheweth further *Cha. 4. 14, 15, 1*
Let vs hold fast our profession, for wee haue not a high priest that can not bee touched with our infirmities, but was in all thinges tempted in like sorte yet without sinne. He closely meeteth heere with an *obiection*. Some might think Chris being so high & heauenly could not haue sufficient compassion towardes our miseries: Nay sayth he *We haue not an high priest which can not be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but hee was in all things tempted in like sorte, Therefore let vs hold faste our profession: and therefore let vs goe boldlie to the throne of grace, that we may receyue mercy and finde grace in due time*, or *in time of need*. Which is as much as to say, If he were not *like* vs in all temptations and sufferings, hee could not minister helpe to vs in time of need: but now he is one that hath felt all our feelings, or the like in euery point. Therfore he can help vs in all need, and wee are not to doubt. And thus by all these Scriptures it is proued that Christ suffered *the wrath of God and the sorrowes of Hell*, which the godlie in this life sometimes doe taste also. Adde hereVnto, that of all Absurdities, this is the greatest, y meere Men should suffer more

Absurdity.

deepely

deepely & more bitterly then Christ did. And yet they doe so, if Christ suffred not at all any sense of Gods wrath nor ỹ sorrowes of hell: which many meere men haue & doe suffer many times, as is aboue declared, and shall further appeare hereafter.

Nowe an other reason, from *Heb. 5. 7.* where thus it is written of Christ: *In the dayes of his flesh he offered vp prayers and supplications with stronge crying and teares vnto him that was able to saue him from death, and was heard in that which he feared*, or, being deliuered *from his feare*. Here first it may be asked, What *prayers and supplications with stronge crying and teares* for feare of death, were these which he poured foorth to God *in the dayes of his flesh?* And where may vve learne them? Wee may learne what these were in the storie of Christes life and death expressed in the Euangelistes in three places. First, where he lifteth vp his voyce, sayinge: *Nowe is my soule troubled: And what shall I saye? Father, saue me frō this hower. But therefore came I into this hower.* The seconde place: where after he had mourned in the garden, saying, My soule is * euery way compassed with sorrowes to death. He goeth a little further & falling on his face, he prayeth saying: *O my Father if it be possible let this cuppe passe from me. Neuertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.* which hee prayeth *three* seuerall times, with such feare & terror of minde

5.

Ioh. 12. 27.

*Math. 26. 38.

ver. 44.

that his body, as yet without all harme
* Luke 22.44 * *trickled downe with clots of blood* in steede of
sweate: and † *an Angell appeared to him com-*
† ver. 43. *forting him.* His sorrowe also and trouble
of minde most terrible beeing expressed
* *ekthambeis-* where he is said to * *be affrighted*, as it were
thai kai ade- *and miserably distressed* because of this bitter
monein. *cuppe.* The third place, where now han-
Mar. 14. 33, ging on the crosse before he dyed † *he cryed*
34.
† Mat. 27. 46. *with a loude voyce, My God, my God, why hast thou*
forsaken me. To these places doubtles this
text in *Heb. 5. 7.* hath relation, saying, That
in the dayes of his flesh hee did offer vp prayers and
supplications, with strenge crying and teares vnto
him that was able to saue him from death, & was
heard in that which hee feared. Nowe these
things being thus considered, I make this
argument: *In all these places it is most certaine*
Christ suffered in his soule the wrath of God due to
our sinnes. Therefore he suffered the wrath of God,
and not his bodily stripes only. The An-
tecedent I proue by 3. reasons, gathered
from these Scriptures. First because hee
nowe suffered *in his soule properly and immedi-*
atlie: My soule is euery way compassed with sor-
rowes. Therefore this was *the wrath of GOD*
for our sinnes which he now suffered: as
Pag. 4. 5. 6. I haue plainlie shewed in the † beginning
of this treatise. 2. Because he so feared &
shunned this conflict, which yet he knew
he deserued not, and was also accordinge
to the will of God for him to suffer. It is
not possible but hee suffred more then
the

the *bodily* death only, it muſt needs be the vnſpeakeable & intollerable *wrath of God* in that he ſo *feareth* it & *deſireth* to ſhunne it. His Diſciples he had * taught carefullie of that point before, ſayinge: *Feare not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the the ſoule: but feare him that can kill both ſoule & body in Hell* Which generally alſo he †commaundeth all the Godly euermore. How can this be that him ſelf ſhould doe contrarie to that, that he commãdeth others? Such folly in the Son of God, far be it frõ vs once to imagine, as that he ſhold ſtagger, & ſhrink, & fayle in that ẅ he ſo earneſtlie warned others of, and ſo ſtraightlie commaunded: viz. not to feare the bodily, giltles, vndeſerued death, & allotted thẽ of God: but therfore rather *to be glad & reioyce*. And accordingly haue infinite manie Martyrs, as their expreſſe ſtories doe witneſſe: * yea wicked and vngodly men, indured with boldnes and great ioy farre more exquiſite and barbarous tormentes & ſharper tortures, as touching the body, then Chriſt could endure? or then can with reaſon be affirmed and attributed to that which Chriſt endured, if we view his paſſion? Haue infinit many meere men don this? And ſhal this *Lyõ of the tribe of Iuda, & Lãbe of God*, that is the prince of patience and of all fortitude be ſo *heauy*, ſo *fearfull*, ſo *miſerably afflicted & diſmayed* afore hand, as the ſtorie declareth, *only for feare of his bo-*

* Math. 10. 28

† 1 Pet. 3. 14, 15. & 4. 13, 16.

* *The Theeues Crucified with Chriſt ſuffered as great bodilie violence as hee did, Luk. 23. 40 They were all togither in one and* the ſame condemnation *Except they ſuffered more then he did, becauſe they continued longer. Ioh. 19. 32, 33.*

dily death? Which alſo he foreknewe a
could not be ignorant of, that he vvas o
dained of God to ſuffer it, and that by t
hands of moſt malitious and furious en
mies? Cā it be thought that Chriſt wou
through feare pray againſt this meere
dily death, and his ſoule be ſo troubled,
frighted, diſtracted therwith, that the v
rie anguiſh and torment of mind ſhou
vvring out of his body *ſweat of clotted blo*
which neuer vvas heard of in any othe
man beſide, & that he ſhould *deſire* ſo ea
neſtly and ſo often to auoid it cleane, an
being in it, to cry out with much weping
that he was forſaken of God? It can not be, I ſa
it can not be, but Chriſt ſhould *ſinne* in ſ
praying againſt the knowne will of God
& againſt his owne moſt willing purpoſe
except vve ſaye it vvas a greater horrou
of punishment that lighted on his verie
ſoule, which partlie by the feeling & part-
lie by the feare thereof did expreſſe ſuch
tokens, and did ſo ſtoniſh and amaze and
ouervvhelme his humane weakenes (a
in very nature ſuch caſes doe & will bring
to paſſe) eſpeciallie novve the *Diuine* aſſi-
ſtaunce of purpoſe withdrawing it ſelfe.
For a man in ſuch amazednes, doeth eaſi-
lie on a ſuddaine become *forgetfull* of him-
ſelfe. And being forgetfull and *aſtoniſhed*
(which an infinit payne preſent, and feare
of more cominge, will quicklie driue vs
into)

Into) no maruell if Christ, as a very man, let fall in this case words nowe and then, vvhich in his good remembraunce hee knevve well enough were as contrarie to Gods will, as they were suteable with *natures instinst* in him. Now then, it was surelie the *horrour of Gods wrath* that oppressed him, seeing it is vaine and senselesse to think his meere bodily torments, yea the *feare* of them did it, or that meere bodilie he suffered † more sharpe and vehement things then anie man euer did. All the deuices and amplifications of some men are but shiftes and trifles to prooue that. And here a fine fable is offered vs withal: that vve should beleeue Christes *bodilye* paynes though so violēt, yet *hastened* they no whit his death at all, neither vvas hee the neerer it at the last, then at the firste for all his payne. Which is a *paradox* in nature, and contrarie to Scripture, whiche saith, *He was like vs in all thinges, sinne only excepted.* But some will saye, He desired this thing *three* tymes in the Garden, and once † before. If this were to the ende that he might escape the feeling of Gods wrath assigned vnto him as the speciall parte of his passion, howe could he be so forgetful so oft of that which he knew full wel, and regarded diligentlie. How could he? Nay how could he not, but be *affrighted, astonished, forgetfull,* & *all confoūded* in his wholl humanity, both in all ẏ powers of *his soule,*

† *See the contrarie pag. 31.*

Note.

Obiection.

† Ioh. 12. 97.

Answere.

and ſenſes of his bodye, not *three* tymes only, but *three skore tymes three tymes*, yea cõtinuallie and without interchãgeable reſpiration, if Gods wrath for ſinne had bin ſtill, and continually reuealed vpon him. For as it pleaſed God to open to his manhood the touche and ſenſe of his wrath ſometymes more, ſometymes leſſe, and ſometymes ſtaying it, So hee was agayne and againe ſometymes more, ſometymes leſſe confounded therewith, and ſometymes a whyle refreſhed. And if this had returned 300. *tymes* vpon him, verelie hee could not but haue ſunke vnder the ſame 300. *tymes* alſo. Alas, we litle thinke what the bitternes of *Gods wrath* is, and what the waight of his indignation is to the feeling of mans ſoule & body. The want of due knowledge and cõſideration whereof, I feare, is one chiefe cauſe of brothing this moſte ſhamefull quæſtion. Rather vvee may beeholde and ſee heere as in a glaſſe, the vnſupportable heauines and intollerable ſmart of Gods anger for our ſinnes, which Chriſt put vpon him ſelfe for our deliuerance: And agayne, that Chriſt became in deed *a man* for vs, when as againe and againe hee could not but ſhrinke and be confounded vnder that burden. If the waight of *Paules Churche* were layed on the backe of anie Gyant in the worlde many and ſundry tymes, were it anie maruell if euery time it cruſhed him

him ſtill to pieces? Much leſſe is it, if the burthen of Gods wrath, farre heauier thē the whole earth oftentymes touchinge a man, he be confounded with it continuallie. Thus then it can not be ſtraunge if often tymes Chriſt fell amazed, confounded, and forgetfull of him ſelfe for feare and griefe, when the agonie was on him, it being euen the ſenſe of Gods wrath, & of the curſe of the Lawe for vs.

If anie ſay, Chriſt as *man* being a finite creature could not feele infinite wrath. Obiection.

I anſwere, The *wrath of God* due to ſinne, as it commeth from God, is *infinite*, as his iuſtice, and as hee him ſelfe is *infinite*. And though Chriſt as a Creature, could not comprehende the infinitneſſe of it, yet he could, being not capable of it, nor able to ſuſteyne it, bee ouerwhelmed and confounded, and aſtoniſhed withit. Anſwere.

If you ſaye, this were to make Chriſt to ſinne if he were ſo diſturbed and ſo diſtracted, and ſo confounded with feare & horrour. Where was his faith, where vvas his patience, vvhere vvas his obedience to God, where was his loue to his church, if nowe he deſired not to drinke this Cup for them? Obiect.

I aunſvvere: All this might bee in Chriſt, and in deede ſo it was, without anie touch of ſinne or defect of grace at all. Nay, vnleſſe this had bene in him, he had ſinned in deede, which blaſphemy God forbid. Anſwere.

Christ though amazed and eõfounded with sorrowes and feares, yet remained still sinneles.

Touching the firste, Notwithstanding all this amazednes and feare in Christ, he sinned not. I graunt *wee* could not but haue sinned in the like, but he did not. Because, euen as if you set two glasses filled, the one with muddy water, and the other with cleere Christall water, and firste lett them stande till all the muddines in the one be settled at the bottome, then shake both these glasses, in the one the mudde ariseth straightway, and defileth all the water there: in the other, although you shake it neuer so much, yet the cleere water, though troubled likewise, remayneth still all cleere as christal: Euen so if anie of vs bee shaken and disquieted with anie trouble, our Muddy affections arisinge doe presentlie defile vs all ouer: but Christ (in whom was Mans true Nature, but not anie the least defilement of Nature) being likewise shaken, hee remayned still cleere from anie the least spott of sinne at all. For to shunne griefe is natural in what we may: and being amazed & forgetfull, Then to shunne that which els we should and would suffer, is no sinne neither, but Natures instinct. And on occasion to bee *forgetfull*, (euen as some * *ignorance*, is not sinne) it is Natures infirmitie, but no sinne. If a man in distresse fall a sleepe, and then lift not vp his heart to God, he sinneth not,

* Marc. 13. 32

nor

nor he that being amazed with ſome violent blowe on the head, calleth not vpon God: becauſe nature is oppreſſed, and can not doe that whiche hee would and ſhould doe. Alſo in this man ſo aſtoniſhed, or in him a ſleepe, we can not ſaye, there is any leſſe grace: There is no decay of faith, nor of obedience, nor of patience, nor of loue. Euen ſo in Chriſt nowe in this caſe, there was no defect of grace, but an infirmitie of nature, which euen by creatiō can not indure the diſpleaſure of God, but by it owns confuſion withall.

Nowe touching the next poinct, That vnleſſe Chriſt were ſo, that is, ſo *aſtoniſhed*, and *forgetfull* by reaſon of the intollerable ſorrowe and horrour which confounded his humane Nature, he had ſinned by theſe requeſtes: whiche blaſphemie God forbid. That is moſt true: and firſt I proue it: and then will anſwere the exceptions againſt it. It is proued manifeſtlie, becauſe if Chriſt had prayed aduiſedlie, and with good memorie againſt the knowne will of God, hee had ſinned. As to pray againſt the taſting of his bitter paſſion, was againſt Gods will known vnto him. Howe appeareth that, euen his knowing thereof? Firſt him ſelfe expreſly † ſaieth it: *Therefore I came into this hower.* Secondlie, hee could not els haue corrected and reprooued (as he did) his owne wordes preſentlie goinge before.

† Ioh. 12. 27.

What

What ſhall I ſay? Father ſaue me from this hour
* Matth. 26. 39 *but therefore I came into this hower.* And, *O
Father if it be poſsible let this Cup paſſe from
neuertheleſſe not as I will, but as thow wilt. An
† ver. 42. † *O my Father if this Cup cannot paſſe away fr*
me, but that I muſt drinke it: thy will be don
* Ch. 14. 36. Marke hath it thus: * *Father, all things*
poſsible vnto thee: take away this Cup from me
Neuertheleſſe not as I will, but as thou wilt.
Therefore Chriſt prayed and deſired, a
plainly corrected his will by Gods w
And in correcting it, it was contrary, y
and he knew it ſo to be. This place ha
bin chiefly vſed of the *Ancients*, & it is ver
ſinguler, againſt the hereſie of the *Mo*
Monothelites. *thelits*, who held that Chriſte had in hi
but one will. This now hurteth not the
heretiks, if it ſerue not vs alſo in this que
ſtion. This place therefore ſheweth h
had a *naturall humane* will at this time co
trary to his *diuine* will, deſiring to ſhunn
paine which he knew hee was to ſuffe
while through *aſtoniſhment* he be though
not himſelfe. Through *aſtoniſhment* I ſa
for els this contrarines of his *humane* w
to his *diuine*, could not haue wanted ſinn
becauſe remembring himſelfe ſuddainl
he knew and acknowledged Gods will t
be that he ſhould ſuffer, which immedi-
atly before he had ſpoken againſt. Third-
lie, this proueth that he knew it was God
Ioh. 12. 27. determinate will, in that hee termeth i
Mar. 14. 42 * *an hower*, that is a time ſet of God for thi
his

his ſuffering, which he deſired to eſcape. Fourthly, becauſe hee ſo mightely *feared* it, therefore doubtleſſe he knew that he was appointed to ſuffer it. Thus it is manifeſt in plaine words he prayed contrary to Gods knowne will: which vnleſſe it were in *aſtomiſhment*, and nature beeing opreſſed with the horror of his paine and feare, hee could not haue wanted ſinne, which God forbid.

Obiection.

As for the *exceptiones* againſt this 1. They ſay all theſe *prayers* and *requeſtes* of his may be that his bodily death might not haue dominion ouer him. And ſo hee might pray and not againſt the knowne will of God. This is abſurd to ſay that he prayed in ſuch feare and horror and terror of minde againſt that which hee * perfectly knew ſhould neuer come to him: namely, that the dominion of death ſhould hold him. Therefore this could not trouble him. Secondly ſome ſay, this in †Iohn, concernes not his paſſion, but his appearance in Gods preſence onely to receiue ſentence againſt Satan the Prince of this world: as it ſemeth ver. 31. I anſwer, Who euer doubted but Chriſte receiued ſentence againſt Satan by his paſſion accompliſhed, the houre wherof now neere approched, & wherof now preſently he had, it ſeemeth, a ſtrong foreraſt: hee heere cleered his people from the power of the Deuill, & Satan himſelfe he vtterly ouerthrew;

Anſwere.

* Mar. 10. 34.

Obiection.

† Ioh. 12. 27.

Anſwer.

threw; which was done so absolutly at his
death that not only him selfe cryed out
it is finished, but also the Apostle sayeth, e-
Col. 2. 15. uen then *he triumphed ouer Sathan*: which in
the next question we shall shewe further.
It is true then, Christ *now received sentence*
against Satan: but therefore had he now
no feeling of his passion? Would hee cry
out, that *his soule was so troubled*, that he wist
not what to say? And yet said then, *Father*
saue me from this hower? Would he bee thus
greeued, afflicted, and distracted *to receiue*
sentence against his enemy? What sence is there
in this? Doe men vse to be terrified, or to
reioyce and triumph when before anie
iudge they haue sentence giuen with them
against their enemy. If you say, only the
presence of Gods Maiestie terrified and
astonished Christes humane infirmitie
though he receiued a benefit. If it were
so with him in receiuing an honor and
dignity from God, would it not bee so
with him much rather in bearing his
curse for our sinnes? interpret this *curse*
how you will. When hee bare it as from
GOD, would not Gods presence then
much more terrefie and affright him?
But the trueth is, the presence of Gods
Maiestie neuer did so grieue, amaze, and
astonish Christes manhood in such cases:
who not onely was his deerest Sonne but
also personally knit and ioyned with God
himselfe, whereby it could not be that the
Maie-

Maiestie so amazed him, which was so vnited to him, and alwayes susteyned him. As also examples most frequent in the Gospel doe declare. How often did Christ pray vnto his Father: he always then presented himself before Gods Maiesty. And doe we read that euer he was vexed, terrefied, and amazed in so doing? namely in Ioh: 17. appeareth there any such passion in all that longe, most earnest, and effectuall prayer? Nothingh lesse verely, nor any where els, where he appeareth before Godsmaiesty for this end to receaue Loue and Honor from GOD. Onely in case of his passion, when hee appeared to receiue *iustice* and *seueritie* at his hand, then in deed his Maiesty and the sense of his seuere iustice proceeding from him might well astonish & cõfound any creature, specially a guilty creature, as *Christ man* was, namely in the *person* and contenance wherin now he appeared. Therefore hee spake these wordes, * in respect of his *passion* now drawing neere: which also the ver. 33. plainly declareth: *Nowe this he sayed, signifying what death he should dye.* For it hangeth with the ver. 32. next before, *And I, if I were lift vp frõ the earth would draw all men vnto me.* And this most plainly hath reference to this verse 27. whereof it is in parte an opening or exposition. Thirdly, Some except further against this † threefolde prayer, *If it bee possible lett this Cuppe passe from me*: that this

* Ioh. 12. 27.

Obiection.

† Math. 26. 39 44.

this was for feare indeed of feeling the wrath of God, but hee felt it not. For as the * Apoſtle ſheweth, He prayed vehemently againſt it, and *was heard* and ſo deuered *from it*. I anſwere, indeed this were a poinct of high wiſedome and ſinguler wit to ſhew that Chriſt in this ſort as the Scripture telleth *feared* Gods wrath, & yet *felt it* neuer a whit. Firſte it is well yow graunt that Chriſt came ſo neere it that he *feared* it, yea hee *ſo feared* it that with ſtrong cryes and teares he prayed againſt it, yea and with the agony thereof *he ſweat bloud* which muſt proceed of ſuch grief of the minde, (ſeing the body was not touched) as was neuer heard of in any man els: & was thus *affrighted* and *diſtreſſed* therwith out of meaſure. If he were thus neere it, then I hope it is neither *impious*, *heretical*, nor *blaſphemous*, for a man to ſay hee *felt* it. For in good ſooth, if to *feare* it bee not to *feele* it any whit at all, ſpecially *ſuch a feare* as this is deſcribed in the Scripture to be, I know not what *feeling* is. Beſides Luke ſayeth, † *He was now in the agony*: then he *felt*, yea moſt bitterly, that which he ſo ſtroue withall. What is that but the *Cuppe* there mentioned, euen of Gods wrath, that hee prayed might *paſſe from him*. Againe howe could he ſo deeply *feare* it, but knowing it was ordayned for him? Shewe me this how he could poſſibly ſo feare it but that he knew Gods will was that hee ſhould drinke

* Heb. 5. 7.

Anſwer. *Chriſt both feared and felt Gods wrath for ſinne.*

† Luk. 22. 44.

drinke of it. And indeed that it was ſo, I haue proued before already. If then hee was *ordayned* to it, moſt certenly he taſted it, he felt it, he indured it. Some will ſay how could he *feare* it if he *felt* it? For *feare* is an expectation of euill to come: and it is written, *He was heard in that which he feared and was deliuered from it.* I anſwer, indeede he both *felt* and *feared* it. Hee felt it intollerably: but yet feared it more: in the diſtreſsfull agony and the very confuſion of the powers of his nature he conſidered not how long it might hold him, and how infinitly more it might yet increaſe vpon him, ſeeing he was not come to the greateſt of his paſſion. This he might *feare*, and yet preſently *feele* ſorrow vnſpeakable to. Herevpon after the inſtinct of nature abhorring frō paine, he deſired to be releaſed, yet ſuddenly reproueth his nature herein: *Not as I will Father, but thy will be done.* Howbeit his *Father* heard him and deliuered him *out of that which hee feared*. Not from feeling it, but from beeing forſaken in it. For the very word ſemeth to ſay, He was in it: *eiſakoustheis*, Hee was heard being in it. You will reply, Chriſt feared not to bee forſaken *in* Gods wrath: he could not *feare* that. Therfore it was not ỻ which in this place God deliuered him *from*. I anſwere two things: Though Chriſt feared not to be forſaken finally in the feeling of Gods wrath, though he could not feare that, nei-

Obiection.

Anſwer.

Apo tes eulabeias.

Obiection.

Anſwer.

neither directly prayed against ỳ point: yet Gods wrath may be it which here he felt & feared, and was deliuered *from*. For he may be truely saide to bee *heard* in his prayer vvhen the Lorde letteth him taste of the Cup for all that, & susteyneth him in tasting it, and in due season deliuereth him out of it. As *Paule* vvas heard in that he prayed for, vvhen * he *besought the Lord Christ to take away from him the messenger of Satan buffitting him*. He vvas hearde, I saye herein, not that this *prick in the flesh was taken away* cleane from him. * But in that he receyued *grace sufficient* to beare it, and in due season to be eased of it. But further I affirme Christs *nature* in ỳ most dreadfull agonie and distemper of al the powers of his soule and body might feare a kinde of *forsaking*, that is, least his humane nature should for a time be left alone and naked from al comfortable feeling of assistance of the Godhead. This kinde of *forsaking* he might and did feare, yea he † felt it aftervvard to most certainly, vvhen he cryed, *My God my God, why hast thou forsaken me*. I say a kinde of *forsaking* this is: for there is another kinde of *forsaking*, which in deede it were blasphemie to say that Christ either felt or feared it. Namely, to be cast away and forsaken vtterly vvith hatred of his Father. This were in deed desperation in Christ, if he had but feared it, which God forbid we should once dreame of. His expresse

Howe Christ was forsaken in his passion.

* 2. Cor. 12. 8.

* vers. 9.

† Matth. 24. 46

preſſe wordes euen then confute that, in calling him *Father*, and in crying earneſtly to him *my God, my God*. This he could not doe but that he was farre from deſperation, or feare of a finall *forſaking*. Yet this letteth nothing at all but he might feare the other *forſaking*, that is touching the payne and ſorrow to be left al comfortles and alone ſome while, the Godhead as it were withdrawing and hyding it ſelfe frō him for the ſeaſon of his paſſion, he being in the ſenſe & feeling thereof: which thing he perceyued his meere manhood was not poſſibly able to endure. And therfore a little before he felt the extremitie of it, he prayed that it might *paſſe from him*, yet preſentlie ſubmitted him ſelfe to it: and after in this very extremitie, when he did not *feare* it, but *felt* it, hee cryed vnder the burthen pitiouſlie, & complayned to his *Father* of it, *why haſt thou forſakē me*. Thus he might *feare* it, and *feele* it, and *crying* to be comforted he might be *heard in it*, & deliuered *out from it*, according to the *ſcripture. I knowe our Contraries doe fancy other ſenſes of this † text, *My God my God, why haſt thou forſaken me*? Sometime they ſpeake as if Chriſt did then but ſinge the Pſalme 22. whiche beginneth with thoſe wordes, *My God my God, why haſt thou forſaken me?* Did he *ſinge*? Wherefore? To ſhewe his patience, his ioye, and triumphe there on the croſſe, ouer all the malice of his enimies?

* Heb. 5. 7.

Obiect.

† Matth. 27. 46

Anſwere.

mies? Naye theſe wordes are contrai
to ſuch ioye, and triumph: *why haſt th*
forſaken me. It is a token of great deiectio
of minde & of rare miſerie to complayn
to be *forſaken of God*: Therefore he *ſung* no
then to triumph ouer his enimies. Whe
fore then? Did he *ſinge* a mournefull an
dolorous lamẽtation to be ſo abandone
and left to the deſpite and rage of th
Iewes all helpleſſe? God forbid we ſhoul
thinke he did ſo pitiouſlie complayne o
that, wherevnto he knewe well he was *or-*
dayned of God, & of his owne moſt willin
purpoſe he offered him ſelfe: yea that he
ſhould be ſo deiected in mind only for hi
bodily ſtripes inflicted by the Iewes, God
forbid we ſhould think him ſo faint har-
ted, as before I haue proued. Neither did
Pag. 51. he amplifie or paint out his ſuffrings *poeti-*
cally: this were vanity in him, & madnes in
vs to think. Therfore it is certẽ, he neither
ſung nor ſaid theſe words to any ſuch mea
Obiection. ning at all. Sometime they think, he here
meant to anſwer the Iewes moſt diſdain-
full mockes & ſkornes, in telling thẽ that
all this their indignity towards him, vvas
propheſied of before, namely in ℣ pſal. 22.
whoſe beginning he repeated to them, as
it were to ſende them thither, where they
ſhould ſee thẽſelues & their doings pain-
Anſwere. ted out long before. Which ſenſe is moſt
abſurd. As if when they had mocked and
reuiled him at noone, or before, he would
then

then 3. *whole houres after* tell them of ſuch an anſwer in ỹ prophet. This is to fond to be ſpoken. But it *appeareth to be euẽ ſo; three whole hours, if not more, after their mocks it was, that he cryed *my God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me.* Sometime againe they thinke he ſpake not this of his owne perſon, but of his myſticall body the *Church*, complayning that nowe his Apoſtles and the reſt ſhould be forſaken, as it were, being bereft of him. This is no leſſe abſurde then the former. There is no neceſſitie, nay no cauſe, nor likelihoode in the world, that [*mee*] here ſhould be taken figuratiuelie for his *Church*. Therefore it muſt †be literal. Againe, he can not complaine ſo dolefullie that his *church* ſhould be now forſaken, *viz.* for his bodily want, ſeing he had armed them for that before, & told them that it ſhould be * better for them that he went, then to tarrie. Whereby they ſhould receyue a greater comfort then his bodilie preſence could yeelde them. And laſtlie, hee had thoroughlie ‡ commended them to the protection of his Father, that it may ſeeme altogeather vnſeaſonable novve, in an other more waightie buſines to bee thus diſquieted with this care. There is no reaſon or likelyhood for it. Sometyme they thinke, it maye ſignifie *compaſsion* for his Countriemen the Iewes: who did now to him, they knew not vvhat, and vvere ſhortlie after

* Mar. 15. 33. 34.

Obiection.

Anſwere.

† *Signifying the perſon of himſelfe.*

* Ioh. 16. 7.

‡ Ioh. 17. 1. &c.

Obiection.

to be all vtterly rooted out and destroy-

Answere. for slaying *the Lord of glory*. This is no le-
but rather more fond & absurd, then t
other. For though hee had no doubt
wayes a moste tender *compassion* euen t
wards his enemies, and specially towar
his whole natiō, yet that [*me*] here shou
signifie *my whole nation* there is no sense
reason in it. Neither had hee forgotte
¶Math. 23 37 that care perticularly in †another plac
as it were wholy appointed for it, when
hee moste tenderly *wept* about it: but nei-
ther there, nor any where complayned t
God why hee would now cast of his peo-
ple, seeing he knewe perfectly Gods wi
in this poinct, that it should be so.

Obiection. Lastly they thinke those words are to
expresse Christes sorrow for our sinning.

Answere. Let vs see: how could Christ conceiue due
sorrow for our sinning but by measuring
it by the wrath of God against sinne? If he
thus measured his sorrowe, then hee must
know exactly Gods wrath due to sinne, if
due to sinne, then due to himselfe, for *hee*
was made sinne for vs. And so hee could not
conceaue due sorrowe for our sinnes, but
he must knowe, and feele it, proceeding
from the wrath of God for sinne vpon
him. And such a sorrow indeed of a *bro-*
ken and contrarie hart is the onely true and
perfectly accepted *sacrifice* to God: and in
effect it is nothing but what wee affirme.
If they meane nothing els but a religious

and

and voluntary griefe in Chriſt ariſing at the cogitation of our ſecure and wanton ſinning, without any feeling in himſelfe of Gods iuſt wrath due to the ſame, which might bee as it were *a zeale* in Chriſt and nothing els, then certenly this pertaineth nothing to the ſacrifice of Chriſts *paſsion*, which he hath heere in hand, but only to the other parte his *morall obedience* and fulfilling the righteouſnes of the lawe in affection of minde, aſwel as in action of bodie. So that this ought not to haue any place heere: ſeeing queſtionleſſe theſe wordes *my God my God, why haſt thou forſaken me*, doe directly and immediatly expreſſe ſome notable parte of his *paſsion* and not of his *righteouſnes* and holy minde. Againe how could theſe words hange togeather, when he meaneth to tell his Father howe zealous he is for his glory to ſay *my God my God, why haſt thou forſaken me*. Surely there is no faſhion in them, thus ſignifying. Therefore it reſteth they muſt needs ſignifie ſimply and plainly (as they doe) that nowe Chriſt felt him ſelfe *forſaken* in the bearing of his intollerable ſorrowes for ſinne: that is not ſuccored at this inſtant by the comfortable aſſiſtance of his *Godhead*, which of purpoſe withheld it ſelfe for a ſeaſon in his paſſion, that hee might throughly accompliſh this perfit ſacrifice anſwerable to the ſeuere iuſtice of God, which thereby he turned away from vs.

Obiection. Neither let anie saye, This *forsaking* ca
not be without Gods *hatred*, and *separatio*
Answer. from God. It may verie easilie: As a te
der and most louing Father will somet
mes sharpelie punish his childe, and she
nothing but a bitter countenance to hi
and so hide his loue that there shall a
peare to the child no token of fauor, no
good wil, and yet in deede he neuer me
neth to cast away his childe, but in du
time wil cherish him againe. Euen so wa
it betweene Christ and his Father. Whic
his Manhood was not able to endure, &
therefore euen by a meere *naturall* desire
prayed that it might cease, and pitiously
complained when it ceased not. I say by
a meere *naturall* desire, not sinfull: Becaus
when his minde was *astonished* at the fur
ous violence of this vnspeakeable hor
rour, then in the instant he leaned to *na*
tures instinct, desiring (without sinne) rest
and being to it selfe, and not destruction.
The like also was his *feare* before in the
Garden, and in the * *foretast* of his passion.
* Ioh. 12. 27. This was, I saye, *a naturall feare*, not a reli
gious feare, nor a mistrustfull feare, nor a
damned feare, but properly a very *naturall*
feare, which well may be vvithout sinne,
Obiection. as is aforesaid. Nay the scripture denieth
† Act. 2. 25. out of Psal. 16 18. this † feare in Christ, as some thinke. *I be*
helde the Lorde alwayes before mee, for he is at my
right hande that I should not stagger, or be shaken.
Heere it is expreslie saide, Christ did not
so

ſo much as *ſhake* or *ſtagger*, no not *at anie time*. Therefore he had no ſuch doubtfull feare, or fearfull doubting when his paſſion appoched: neither in deede could it be without ſome diminution of faith, patience, and obedience in Chriſt, whiche God forbid. In deede God forbid that: Farre be it from vs to think any the leaſt diminution in Chriſt of his faith, patience or obedience to God. But I ſaye againe, there are two kindes of *ſhakinge* and wauering: either in truſt and confidence of Gods loue and protection towardes him: Herein we affirme Chriſt was not touched. Another *ſhaking* there is meere naturall, a confounding of the powers of the minde and the ſenſes of the body: with a naturall effect following thereon, that is, abhorring of payne, ſpeciallie being furious and extreame. This was in Chriſt in aſmuch as he had true *nature*, & was paſſible like vs. I ſay, thus the powers of nature in him might bee confounded, when an infinite burthen of ſorrowe lay vpon him, and his memorie might be diſturbed, and then nature deſiring and wiſhing ſuddenlie eaſe and reſt, hee might ſuddenlie vtter ſomewhat, which els reaſon in him would haue controuled: whiche quicklie it did agayne, we ſee in ſaying: *Yet not my will, but thine bee done*, as it were, ſuddenlie comming to him ſelfe agayne. If yet anie ſtande vppon this,

Anſwer.

Obiection. That *he beheld the Lorde alwayes, not sometime* only or for the most parte, but *always before him*, and therefore could neuer be so astonished. It is ridiculous to stretch that *alwayes* so farre: it being meant, that Christ neuer lost his confidence in God. Which they doe not, who by some violence are striken into astonishement, or naturally fall on sleepe. Their faith, patience, loue, obedience, decreaseth not in them for all that. Euen so, neither in Christ, his assurance in God, could neuer decay: albeit his sinlesse nature might and did feare the paine, & being astonished with excessiue paine might and did suddēly desire ease.

Answer.

Obiection. But this is great curiositie, yea presumption to affirme what Christ nowe feared, and what he felt: as if one should take vpon him to tell what Moses and Elias said to Christ in his transfiguration. Surely, yea, it is curiositie alike in deed. For when *Luke* telleth vs, we may presume to tell it againe, and affirme what it was. *They spake of his departure which he should accomplishe at Ierusalem.* Euen so when all the Euangelistes tell vs by Christes owne wordes what hee feared, and what he felt, we may well presume to affirme it. *Mathewe* and *Luke* tell vs, that it was *to drinke of his Fathers Cuppe*, which he *feared*, & in fearing *felt*: yea further it is †expressed that *God forsooke him*. *Marke* and *Iohn* doe call it *an hower*. What is that *hower*, but this his †appointed suffe-

Answer.

Luk. 9. 31.

Elegon ten exodon autou hen emelle pleroun en Hierusalem

† Math. 27. 46

† *And therefore knowen to himselfe.*

ring

ring for ſinne? This was it then, without all queſtion, that draue him into theſe his moſt wonderfull and pitious *agonies, feares, ſorrowes, miſeries, outcryes, teares, aſtoniſhment, forgetfulnes*, and confuſion of the powers of nature, as before is declared out of the verie Scripture. Therefore *this Cuppe*, and *this hower*, this *forſaking* of God, can not bee only *a bodily death*, but a more intollerable ſuffering that ſo afflicted him, euen the verie ſenſe of the wrath of GOD due to our ſinnes which he ſuſteyned. And this we neede not feare to ſay. And ſo much for the* ſecond *argument*, out of theſe wordes, touching his *fearing* and *ſhunning* his paſſion in ſuch ſorte, as we ſee he did.

* See pag. 49

An other *Argument* is taken hence alſo: Becauſe he was *heard* in his ſuffering, whiche he *feared*, and was deliuered *from it*. But he was not deliuered from his *bodily death*, but he felt it indeed: Neither was it the dominion of death which he feared: for he knew perfectly that he ſhould riſe againe. Therfore it was none of all theſe that heere is meant which hee *fearing* and *feeling* was deliuered *from*. But needes it was the ſence of Gods *curſe* for ſinne and his wrath when he forſooke him, wherin he was *heard*, and deliuered *out*, as before is declared.

I know the contrarie is vrged euen from this place thus. That wherin he was *heard* and deliuered *from by prayer*, he feared, but felt

Obiection.

felt not. But Christ was *heard* and delivered by prayer *from* the wrath which he feared. Therfore he felt it not. Nay euen therefore he felt it. We denie therefore the first *proposition*. For he was in some sense of it, when he prayed against it and was heard: he had the some foretastes, but the extremitie came after, which he before feared. And finally he being *in* al this, was *heard* (as the *very worde seemeth to import) and deliuered *from it*, that is at least not before he had felt it. Againe the very *fearing* of Gods wrath is a *true feeling*, I saye not a *full* feeling, but a *true* feeling. But it is graunted that nowe in this Agonie he *feared* the wrath of God: Therefore he truelie *felt it*. Therefore the quæstion is graunted.

Answer.

*Eisakoustheis Also Luk. 22. 44.

To feare Gods wrath is indeed to feele it in parte.

Here the †Papists doe denie our translation, not yeelding that we should reade *from [his] feare*. But let them also consider that this verie worde not only in other Authours, but in the †Scripture, is vsed for a *perplexed feare*. Also the Greeke Præposition *apo* signified naturally *from* or *Out of*, as we turne it. Finallie the circumstaunces of this text are most sutable to this meaning, viz. to set out Christes sorrowes and feares in his passion. Therfore our translation is true and sounde. But as I sayde, this is not nowe called in question among our selues.

Obiection.

Answer.

† Rhem. Test. Annot. in Hebr. 5. 7.

* Apo tes eulabeias.

† Act. 23. 10.

* Eulabetheis.

Other

Other Obiections are lett fall, as this: Obiection.
The ſufferinge of *Hell* tormentes, is not meritorious: † neither is GOD pleaſed with any mans *death*. Therefore Chriſt ſuffred no ſuch torments. This is as good againſt his *bodily* paines. Bodily paynes ſimplie *merit* not, neither doeth God ſimplie delite in his creatures *bodily* death. But God is delighted with the execution of *iuſtice* both on our bodyes and ſoules. And further, Chriſts ſufferings are not as the ſufferings of other creatures. All that he ſuffered was truely and properlie *meritorious*, yea his ſufferinge of Helliſh torments proceeding from the wrath of his iuſt Father. No other creatures ſuch ſuffering can be, but his was infinitelie *meritorious*, becauſe of the infinite excellency of his Godhead, being one perſon with his manhood. Thus farre hereof. † Ezec. 33. 11. Anſwer.

Now to goe on: I proue theſe ſuffrings of Chriſt further in theſe wordes: * *Thorough death he aboliſhed him that had the power of death, that is the Diuell.* I ſay, *If this death here ſpoken of bee ſpeciallie the death of the ſoule, then Chriſt ſuffered the death of his ſoule, whereby hee deſtroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Diuell. But death heere is ſpecialie taken for the death of the ſoule: Therefore Chriſt ſuffered the death of his ſoule, that is the wrath of God.* This reaſon will ſeeme altogeather vnreaſonable, and harſhe in the eares 6. * Heb. 2. 14.

of

of some, to say the least of it. But let them soberly consider it, and it is most true and euident. First we meane not that his soule was *mortall* and perished, or came to nothing, as the soules of beastes doe, such death is not meant, when wee speake of the soules death: But the *death* which soules immortall can suffer. Note therefore the bodily *death* is taken two wayes, and accordinglie the † soules *death* is takē two wayes also. First, *death* strictlie, and properlie taken, is the verie separation of the soule from the body: and so the soules death is the separation of Gods fauour & grace from it. Thus Christes soule dyed not: it were impious in deede, and blasphemous so to say, yea it was impossible so to be. But besides this sense, *death* is often vsed otherwise, as when we saye, *Hee suffered a bitter death*, a painfull *death*, wee meane not now the verie separation whiche is death in deed. For death in deede is sensselesse, quiet, and without paine: the body beeing dead in deede hath no more griefe: What then is this *bitter death paynefull death*? Surelie it is the feelinge of the paines and pangs of death, which do procure and bring on, and foreshewe death insuing. Yea men liuing being surprised with grieuous sorrowes and paynes, vvill saye * *they dye, they perish, &c.* And further, that is called *death* sometymes whiche is such a suffering of hurt and payne, as maketh

† *The Soules death of 2. sortes.*

* *Terent: Occidi: perij: interij.*

keth a body ſeeme † quite dead, and yet is not. So likewiſe the *death* of the ſoule ſometimes may be vnderſtood, and that moſt fitlie for the paynes and ſufferinges of Gods wrath whiche * alwayes accompanie them that are *ſeparated* from the grace and loue of God. Now this *death of the ſoule* we affirme † Chriſt ſuffered, that is, the wrath of God, and the horrour of his ſeuere iuſtice, like them who be ſeparated in deede from the grace and loue of God, yet him ſelfe neuer ſeparated, but alwayes moſt intirelie beloued, as is before declared.

† Act. 20. 9. 10

* *Alwayes ordinarily.*

† *Extraordinarily.*

Some will ſay, *death* heere in this text may ſignifie Chriſtes bodily death, wherby he *aboliſhed* the Diuell & all his power ouer vs. That can not be here, ſeeing *death* being twice heere named, the latter with a referẽce to the former, ſurelie this word *death* hath the ſame meaning in both places: verie fonde it were to take it here otherwiſe. Nowe it is queſtionleſſe in this latter place *death* ſignifieth the *death of the ſoule*, the tormentes and ſorrowes of the damned, whiche are ſeparated from the life of God: of which *death* the Diuell is ſaide to haue the power and execution, and we (*in the next verſe*) to be *in the feare* of this *death* before our *deliuerance*. Therefore in the former place *death* ſignifieth ſo too, euen the death of the ſoule, that is, the tormentes and ſorrowes due to the damu-

Obiection.

Anſwer.

Ver. 15.

What death of the ſoule Chriſt ſuffered.

damned proceeding from the iustice and wrath of God: by which *death* Christ indeed abolished him that had the power of the same death, that is the *Diuell.*

7. Lastely in 1. Pet. 3. 18. That Christ in his suffering for vs was † *done to death in the flesh, but made aliue by the Spirite.* In this place *the Spirite* signifieth the almighty Spirit of God *whereby*, hee that was *done to death* was *made aliue* againe, according to these Scripturs: * *He was crucified concerning his infirmitie but liueth through the power of God,* † and *Whom God raysed vp loosing the sorrowes of death,* * and *According to the fleshe hee was made of the seed of Dauid, but according to the Spirite by the resurrection from the dead hee was mightely made manifest to bee the Sonne of God.* And thus the *Spirite* heere in Peter also signifieth the Godhead, *whereby* Christ *putt to death, was raised to life againe.* Yet for al this some take *Spirit* heere to be Christes humane Soule, which certainly can not bee: seeing then Peter must say, *He was made a liue* either *in* his soule, or els *by* his soule. But both these are absurd, and most false, that Christ was made aliue either *in* his humane Soule, or *by* the same. Therefore the *Spirite* heere is his Deity, *by the which* after his death *hee was made a liue* indeede. Againe, when soeuer in Scripture the Fleshe and the Spirite are opposed togeather, the Spirite is neuer for a Humane Soule: and in Christ it is alwayes his Deitie. And then the Flesh

† *Thanatotheis men sarki zoopoietheis de tō pneumati.*

* 2. Cor. 13. 4.
† Act. 2. 24.
* Rom. 1. 3. 4.

Fleſh alſo is alwayes Chriſtes whole Humanitie: I ſay not his Body only, but his Soule alſo, euen his intire and whole humanitie. As alſo that word † *Infirmitie* before noted, doth likewiſe ſignifie. From hence now it followeth, that Chriſts *Soule* alſo *dyed* and was *crucified* according to the death and crucifying. Which ſoules are ſubiect vnto and capable of, that is the feeling of Gods wrath, as I ſhewed a little before. I ſay the reaſon is, becauſe not one parte of Chriſtes manhood but both parts euen his whole and intire manhood is heere manifeſtly meant, where it is ſaid, *He was done to death*, or *made to dy in the Fleſh*. If yet there be any doubt againſt this ſenſe, we ſhal haue fitter place afterward, in our *next queſtion* to confirme it better. Some other friuolous obiections are made as *Hell* is not in this life, Therefore Chriſt ſuffered not *Hell*. Hell is the burning of Materiall fire, Chriſt ſuffered no materiall fire. Therefore Chriſt ſuffered not the paines of *Hell*. If Chriſt were in *Hell*, then holines, faith, patience, and all goodnes may be in *Hell*: But only the contrary is there. Therefore Chriſt ſuffered not the paines of *Hell*.

† 2. Cor. 13. 4

Obiection.

I anſwer firſt † as in the entrance I noted. If we ſpeake of *Hell* in the vſuall and proper ſenſe as it is *the very ſett place for* the tormenting of the damned, or *the verie eſtate* and *condition* of the damned: So none of vs euer meant that Chriſt was there

Anſwer.

† Pag. 33.

there, or felt any thing therein. But vn-
derſtanding thereby *the ſeuere wrath of G*
due to ſinne, which may well bee calle
Hell by compariſon, ſeeing the ſorrowe
and horrors of Gods firie wrath are equi
to *Hell*: So wee affirme, Chriſt was in *He*
euen in this life, he ſuffered *Hell* for vs, o
rather *Helliſh* ſorrows. Otherwiſe then ſo
we neuer thought. Therefore it is great
iniquitie, yea plaine *ſophiſtry* to amplifie a-
gainſt vs, & to make this moſt holy truth
odious with the people, onely by the am-
biguitie of the word *Hell*. Know therfore
Hell as we take it, (that is the ſenſe of Gods
wrath) is euen in this life, found ſome-
tyme. As *Heauen* is likewiſe, that is, ſome
vnſpeakeable foretaſte of the infinite ioy
prepared for the Godly hereafter: as † ap-
† 1 Cor. 2. 9. 10 peareth: *The thinges which eye hath not ſeene, no*
eare hath heard, neither came into mans harte,
which God hath prepared for them that loue him,
the ſame hath God reuealed vnto vs by his Spirite,
for the Spirite teacheth all thinges, yea the deepe
things of God. Thus you ſee, as there is *Hea-*
uen euen in this life in ſome meaſure: e-
uen ſo there may bee *Hell*. Yea wee haue
* Pag. 46. ſhewed it * before in *Iob* and *Ionah* & *Da-*
uid, &c. And as for the wicked, they many
tymes finde it farre more intollerable, as
only *Cain* for the reſt, will ſerue to teſti-
fie. Oh ſaieth he, † *my ſinnes*, that is my hor-
† Gen. 4. ror for my ſinnes, *is heauier then I can beare.*
Now, *Chriſt* I doubt not, as touching the
vehe-

vehemency of paine, was as ſharply touched euen as the reprobates themſelues, yea if it may bee more extraordinarily, ſeing herevnto he was ordayned of God, and the *Godhead* as it were layed it vpon him, euen to the ſatisfactiō of his ſeuere iuſtice. Further as touching *materiall fire* in Hell what a toyiſh fable is that: then ſay aſwell there is a *materiall worme* in the conſcience that dyeth not, *materiall brimſtone* and *much wood* which the fire burneth vpon: All which the Scripture affirmeth like as it doeth the *fire*. But who ſeeth not that the ſcriptures, as their vſe is, do here vnder materiall and known things, teach vs inuiſible and ſpirituall matters, which for their effects are like to them, euen as horrible and intollerable as they, and ſo moſt fitly reſembled by them. And els I pray how may the Souſes of the damned ſuffer by *materiall fire* ſeing they are *Spirits*, and therefore with them and *fire materiall* there can be no communion. But let it be as it may be. The locall *Hell* of the damned we ſpeake not of, neither I truſt ſhall we euer knowe it. And therefore conſequentlie here is no preiudice to the heauenlie vertues of Chriſt.

And thus there is nothing worth naming againſt the ſufferings of *Chriſt* to be equall to the verie *Helliſh* torments in vehemencie of paine and ſharpenes. The excellencie of which moſt *Chriſtian doctrine* may be

further noted by these consequences.

1. *Christian reasons according to Godlynesse, which require also that Christ should suffer the wrath of God.*

First it were a mightie terrifying of v and a strong pulbacke from suffering martyrdome for Christes trueth. See by the storie of his passion in the Gospe there appeareth no such barbarous a exquisite tormentes inflicted on Christ bodye when hee suffered for me, as no my furious and beastlie aduersaries, a like to inuent and inflict on me for him Also if he, feeling nothing but bodyl smart, yet was so dismayed and so feare full, yea so confounded as it were in howe shall I, most weake wretch, hope t susteyne and suffer victoriously thes dreadfull torments inuented for me, yea know not whether Sathan peraduenture withal will conflict with my cóscience in the middest of myne intollerable paines which if Christ tasted not of, how shall wretch, be so venturous, as to put my self into them, and hope to out stande them. And so by this meanes what courageous Christian, entering into these thoughts, would not vtterlie shrink, & cease to suf-

2. fer for Christ. Further, we could not so well haue knowne howe extreamelie the Lord hateth and punisheth sin, as now he sheweth vs. Seeing his own Sonne could not scape, but in that hee would deriue our sinns from vs to him self, euen therefore he should smart for it in the highest degree: and the Fathers iustice should be

as

as ſeuere on him, as on anie reprobate. But if it were not ſo, then it might come into our mindes, the Lorde can and will qualifie his iuſtice where he loues: & then he may pittie mee, and ſo manie infinite thouſandes mo, who all of vs euen of nature cõmit ſins, yet are his own creatures.

Againe, hereby his victorie & triumph ouer ſinne & death, is infinitely the more glorious, in hauing ſuffered firſt, ſuch extreame humiliation, rather then if he had had but a light & eaſie combat. 3.

Alſo the exceeding loue of God towardes vs is the notablier ſet out. For the more he debaſed & puniſhed his owne moſt deare Sõne for vs, the more wonderfully & vnſpeakablie he loued vs. 4.

Laſtlie, heerein a farre greater comfort and aſſurance remaineth for vs, conſidering what great thinges he hath done and ſuffered for our ſakes, rather then if he had endured none ſuch. For thus we neede not feare that any iott can nowe remayne vnpayd by Chriſt, but we are aſſured that all is finiſhed, and that no whit ſhall henceforth be layed to our charge, being by his grace acquited from ſuch extremities. 5.

Nowe whereas ſome ſaye, The littlenes of Chriſtes ſuffering doeth more ſett out the power and vertue thereof, when as onlie by his bodye, both our Soules and Bodyes are fullie ranſomed: that is *ſo much with ſo little.* Obiection.

answere, it is nothing so: for then th
might more haue appeared, if only he
had shed a drop or two of his blood, an
not so much, and had felt a stripe or tw
and not so many woundes, and but som
one crosse and that for a short while, bu
not a life of miseries, & a death of incom
parable sorrows, as the wisedome of Go
appointed that he should and he did suf
fer. Therefore this reason is but vanitie
and all such like against our assertion.

And hitherto it sufficeth to haue taught
from the Scriptures *That Christ suffered for*
vs both in his soule and body the wrath of God, a
Hellish torments, to ransome vs from the same.

Obiection. Now because it is stoutly said that the
contrarie hath alwayes bene beleeued in
the *Church*, and our opinion neuer known
Answere. this 1400. yeares, It shall not be amisse to
confute this notorious vntruth by the
testimony of Godly men in sundry ages
since. First taking this by the way, that
Note. if they they somewhere seeme variable
herein, they doe but shew what they are,
that is indeed not fit to be brought as the
vmpieres of causes in controuersie, nor
iudges of the Scriptures sense, howsoeuer
yet they are proffitable to helpe vs in the
way, if we leane not to them wholy, nor
Note. yet despise them wholy. Noting this
withall, that it is no meruayle if this do-
ctrine were not so plainly vttered nor so
fully set downe in former times, as nowe

of

of late it hath bin, becauſe we neuer finde it to haue bin directly in queſtiō, as lately we haue ſeene it to bee. And therefore in theſe later times doubtles it hath bin better ſifted, and more perfitlie taught, then euer heeretofore ſince the Apoſtles age.

Howe ſo euer it be, thus ſaieth * *Ierom: Quod (maledictum) nos pro noſtris debebamus ſceleribus ſuſtinere, ille pro nobis paſſus eſt, pacificans, &c.* The ſame (Curſe) he ſuffered for vs, which we ſhould haue borne for our owne ſinnes.

Teſtimonies of the Ancient Writers.

* *Com. in Iſa. cap. 53.*

† *Cyprian: Dicendo, Quare derelictus ſum, indicat anxietates illius querimonia verba eſſe* delictorum ſuorum, *quorum perſonam & cauſam aſſumpſit. Per Moſen & Apoſtolum ſuſtinuit vocari Peccatum & Maledictum,* pro ſimilitudine pœnæ, *non culpæ: quod pro eis voluit intelligi, qui deſeri à Deo propter peccata meruerant.* In ſaying, Why haſt thou forſaken me, hee ſheweth the ſorrowes of that his complayning to be the wordes of *his ſinnes*, whoſe perſon and caſe he tooke vpon him. He was content to be called by Moſes and the Apoſtle, Sinne and a Curſe, *becauſe of the likenes of the puniſhment*, not of the fault. And this he would haue vs to knowe that it was for them, or in their ſteede, who by reaſon of their ſinnes, deſerued to be forſaken of God.

† *De Paſſione*

* *Ambroſe: Ego autem non ſolum excuſandum non puto, ſed etiam nuſquam magis pietatem eius maieſtatemq; demiror. Minus enim cōtulerat mihi, niſi meum ſuſcepiſſet affectum. Ergo pro me doluit, qui pro ſe nihil habuit quod doleret: Et ſequeſtratâ delectatione Diuinitatis aternæ, tadio meæ infirmitatis afficitur. Mœrorem animæ noſtræ, ſuæ animæ mœrore aboleuit.* I doe eſtreme Chriſt (in this his ſuffering) not only not to be excuſed, but alſo in deed I doe no where more admire his gracious loue and his Maieſtie.

* *Com. in Luc. 22. De triſtit. dolor. &c.*

stie. For he had done lesse for me, if he had not [cc] be affected as I should haue bene. Therefore he sorrowed for me, as hauing nothing to be grieued at for him selfe. And the ioye of his eternall Godhead being sett a side, hee was troubled with the tediousnes of my infirmitie. Hee also shed the sorrowe of our soule by the sorrowe of his soule.

[cc] Or, taken on him my affections.

And * againe, *Deus, Deus meus quare dereliquisti me? Clamauit homo* Diuinitatis sepa ratione *moriturus.* O God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? The Man Christ did crye, *his Godhead being departed away*, & he about to dye. He meaneth the Godhead was departed frō him, not vtterly in deed, but touching any comfort or strength that he felt of it then when he was left in his most grieuous sorrowes.

* In Cap 23. de cōmendatione Spiritus, &c.

Againe † he saieth, *Hoc in se obtulit Christus, quod induit: Et induit quod ante non habuit.* Christ *offered that in sacrifice* which he assumed: & he assumed all that, which before he had not. That is to say his Soule was *offered* as a sacrifice, and not his body only.

† De incarnationis Sacramento. Cap. 6.

Tertullian likewise saith, * *Quid de isto quæris? Habes ipsum exclamantem in passione, Deus meus, Deus meus, Ut quid me dereliquisti? Ergo Filius patiebatur à Patre derelictus: hæc vox carnis & animæ, id est Hominis, non Sermonis nec Spiritûs est.* What inquire you of him? You heare him crying out in his passion, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? The Sonne therfore suffered, being forsaken of his Father: but this is meant of the Flesh *and of the Soule*, that is, of the Manhood, not of the Godhead. If any obiect, that which followeth, *Relinqui à Patre, mori fuit Filio.* This forsaking of the Father, is but that the Sonne dyed. Hee meaneth heere that *death* which was awarded for sinn: that is, both of the Soule and Flesh.

* Contra Praxeam,

† Cyrill also, *Carnem quidem suam in redemptionis precium pro carne omnium impendens, & animam suam similiter pro omnium animâ redemptionis precium constituens.* He bestowed his Flesh as a ransome for our flesh: likewise he made *his Soule a price of redemption* for our Soules. Thus

† De recti fid. ad Theodos.

Thus much haue we of the ancient Writers, and much more no doubt, as they know who are better conuerſant in them then my ſelfe. Howbeit this ſufficeth to ſhewe that they held, *Chriſt to haue ſuffered* properly *in his Soule for our ſinnes*, and that *his Soule was made an Offering and price of redemption*, & not his flesh only. Yea that *his Soule felt the ſeparatiō of the Godhead* in his perſon, and that he withdrew at that time *all comfort* from the ſame, and ſo ſuſteyned *the ſame Curſe, the like punishmēt*, which we ſhould haue done. Wherfore ſurelie the ancient times ſince the Apoſtles haue alſo known and taught and beleeued euen that which we teache, and beleeue in this behalfe.

There are alſo ſome of the modeſteſt* *Papiſtes* that here doe ioine with vs likewiſe. But to come to the *Proteſtant* Writers, lett this be chieflie noted: I doe not ſay ſome of them, or the moſt, or the beſt, but all & euery one both Churches and Writers in the world, who are *Proteſtantes*, teache as we do. Neuer was there any voyce heard any where openly to the cōtrarie, before nowe in Lōdon of † late. Except only the whoteſt and cunningeſt Papiſtes, Ieſuiſts, Prieſtes, and Fryars, who in deed alwayes vntil this day, haue had this controuerſie with all *Proteſtantes*, & all *Proteſtants* againſt them. As "*Bellarmine*, & † *Campian*, principall *Ieſuites*, doe teſtifie, * *Feuardentius* the Fryar, and our "*Rhemiſh Seminarie Prieſtes*.

* *Cuſanus in Pſ. 30. Ferus in Mat. 26.*

Note.

† Anno 1597.

" *Tom. 1. Con. 2. Lib. 4. cap. 8*

† *Rat. 8.*

* *De Chriſto Patient. Dialog. 5.*

" *Annotat. in Mat. 27. 46. Heb. 5. 7.*

In whom, and ſpecially in *Bellarmine* and *Feu ardentius* we finde the very argument and reaſons, or rather the ſilly ſophiſmes which it hath pleaſed ſome among vs to gather togither, & to paint thē with faire colours, and to ſcatter them in England as precious ſtuffe. Now laſtly if we looke to our ſelues in *England*, al our worthy Preachers & Writers hitherto haue bin cleare contrary always. Mr *Fulk* in his anſwer to ‖ *Rhemiſts:* †Mr *Deering*, whoſe name is ſtil reuerend in London: Mr *Whitakers*, a noble light in our Churches of late, *ſaith thus: *Erat Deus nobis propter peccatū iratiſſimus, Chriſtus ſe interpoſuit, eiuſq; iram & vim omnem in ſe vnus effuſam ſuſtinuit. Quis ergò Chriſtum nihil (huiuſmodi) ſenſiſſe putat, & peccati magnitudinem & Dei iuſtitiam, & Chriſti meritum tollat. Quod ne fuerit abſorptus, Deitati tribuendum eſt* God was moſt wrathfull with vs for ſinne: Chriſt put him ſelfe betweene, and ſuſteyned all alone the whole vehemēcie of his wrath poured vpon him. He therefore that thinketh Chriſt felt not (*any ſuch thing*) doeth take away the grieuouſnes of ſinne, the iuſtice of God, & the merit of Chriſt. It was becauſe of his Godheads aſſiſtance, that he was not ouerwhelmed and ſwallowed vp quite.

‖ *Answere to the Rhem. Teſtam. in Mat. 27. 46. and Heb. 5. 7.*
† *Lectur. in Hebr.*
* *Contr. Dura. pag. 558.*

And beſides theſe, many other moſt excellent men, and namely Mr *Nowell* in his "Catechiſme is ſo pregnant in this point, as no mā liuing is more. This Catechiſme is authoriſed in a whole † *Synode*, and commanded to be taught to all our youth in England. Alſo our great * Bible appointed by Authority to be read in publike Churches expreſſie ſaieth as much. Is not this

" *On the article of the Creed He deſcended into Hell.*
† *Syn. Lond. Anno 1571.*
* *Annotat. in Luke 22. 44.*

now

now our *Englishe Churches* expresse & cõstant doctrine, it beeing neuer repealed since? Yes verily. Cõsidering also that the now † *Archbishop* of *Canterbury* with 3. other great Bb. haue expresly giuen it this allowance. Howsoeuer of late he hath by his letters * allowed Mr *Bilsons* cõtrary doctrine that it might be printed, albeit yet it proceded not. To conclude, I will adde now finallie the consent not of one or two, nor of our Churches in England simply, but of our publike *Lawes* of the Realme, that it may throughly appeare our doctrine to be the publike authorized doctrine of England. The booke of *Homilies*, established by † Act of Parliament hath thus: "In the beginning of the Homil. of the Passion, or presently after, setting down certaine partes & degrees of *Christs passion*, first how *he deliuered him self* of his heauẽly glorie, and debased him self to the condition of a man, yea of such a man as was subiect to many infirmities & disgraces, by & by he cõmeth to his death on the Crosse, as the last and greatest part of his suffring. The which he expresseth thus, *He put him self betweene Gods deserued wrath & our sinne*. Where this † *putting him self betweene Gods deserued wrath & our sinn* being expresly made a part and degree of Christs *suffring* for vs, it followeth that the Homelie expresly teacheth *Christ suffered the wrath of God for vs as a parte of his Passion*, & price of redemption. Againe it saith, * *He tooke*

† *In the Admonit. to the people of Engl. pag. 66.*

* *As it is certainly reported*

† *Eliz. An. 13 cap. 12.*

" *Homil. 1. of the Passion.*

† *Euen as also M. Whitak. vseth this phrase pag. 11.*

* *Homil. 2. of the Passion.*

tooke vpon him the iust reward of sinne. The [illegible] *reward* is that which Gods law appoin[illegible] against sinne: which is the † death of [illegible] Soule (as it is called) in deede the feel[illegible] of the fierce wrath of God, & not the b[illegible]dily death only. Thus seeing also by [illegible] Hom. sentence, *Christ tooke vpon him the* [illegible] *reward of sinne*: Surely the doctrine of o[illegible] Churches publiklie allowed by Lawe [illegible] England, doth plainly auouch that Chr[illegible] suffred the wrath of God for vs. And wh[illegible] soeuer saith nay, he resisteth, yea hee d[illegible]praueth* the doctrine of Christ authoriz[illegible] in Englande.

† Gen. 2. 17.

*In saying it is hereticall, impious, and blasphemous.

And here is it likely (Christian brethre[illegible] that all the late holy men of God shou[illegible] hitherto vniversally erre, and only the P[illegible]pistes, their Iesuites, their Fryars, & tra[illegible]terous Priestes, haue the trueth herein [illegible]gainst vs? In this so greate a light of th[illegible] Gospel, as lately hath shined out of dark[illegible]nes, and in this so waightie, & religious [illegible] cause? I say, is this likely by anie meane[illegible] Neither hath this point ben couered in [illegible]lence, but namely and particularly sifte[illegible] and tried to the quick, and alwayes nota[illegible]bly approued & determined euery whe[illegible] against the Papistes. What iniurie then [illegible] this to Gods Church, for one that profes[illegible]seth himself a friend, to agree with none in such a case, but with the enimies there[illegible]of? But let it be possible that all *Protestant*[illegible] hitherto haue herein erred, & now some

one

one or two of them beginne to ſpy the trueth out of *Bellarmine:* I will not ſimply denie, but this is poſſible to be, although nothing more vnlikelie. Yet is this likely that only the authour of this cõceit with vs, a man of wealth, plenty, and worldlie honour, ſhould haue this ſingular trueth reuealed vnto him, before all the reſt of our moſt worthy laborers in Gods church this many yeares, who were certainlie, in all mens reaſon, farre likelier for diuers reſpects to diſcerne of the feelings of cõſcience, & of the wrath of God for ſinne: & ſo conſequentlie might he or they ſee better, how needful it was that the Sonne of God ſhould taſt thereof, or not, to free vs therfrom? Surely I muſt needes ſaye, to think him the likelieſt of all other which haue gone before, and yet are, moſt ſingular lightes, to finde out this doctrine for vs, that point verily I can neuer admit, albeit I iudge him not, nor any man. Only I hope, I haue ſufficientlie cleered this our firſt quæſtion, and proued it by the Scriptures, that *Chriſt hath ſuffered for vs the wrath of God* to redeeme vs from it. The which I wholy ſubmit to the iudgement of the Godly, deſiring them only to conſider, what I haue before written: which alſo moſt gladlie I doe in all other thinges, whatſoeuer hereafter I do, or ſhall write.

THAT

THAT CHRIST AF TER HIS DEATH ON the Crosse, went not into Hell in his Soule.

THis wee ought also in *Christian fai* to beleeue, *that Christ after his dea on the crosse, went not into Hell in his soul* And heere because that article o our cõmon Creed wilbe obiected straigh against vs, *He descended into Hell*, we will b Gods helpe firste make plaine this artic according to Christian verity & the Scri ptures sence: Secondly we will proue ou assertion by the Worde, that Christ wen not into *Hell* after his death on the crosse.

Touching the common Creed called the Apostles Creede What we are to acknowledge.

And first to say somewhat in generall o our common *Creed* vsually called the *Apostles Creed*: we acknowledge it to be an ex cellent short summe of Christian faith: wherein are all the necessarie and chiefe heades of saluation compriſed, and nothing but is consonant to the Apostles doctrine, beeing taken aright. Also wee acknowledge it so ancient, as if the Godlie Christians gathered it not in the Apostles times, yet certenly, it was very soone after them. For * *Ignatius* runneth vpon the very articles of this Creede: *Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius*, doe shewe likewise that such *a rule of faith* was ancientlie

* *Ad Trall:*

knowne

knowne before their times. So that wee knowe it could not be made very longe after the Apoſtles times: I meane if not this whole Creed as now it is, yet ſurely a great parte of it, and namely this article, *He deſcended to Hades*, whereof *Ignatius* in the foreſaid place doth ſpeake, & others moſt auncient likewiſe. For we muſt know as the trueth is, This Creede was made not all at once, but ſundry articles were made and added, ſome after other as occaſion required, til it came to this whole ſumme and fulnſſe, which now it is at. For when by occaſion of Heretikes ariſing and calling in queſtion anie maine poincte of faith, open error beganne to aſſaile the Church, then the Godly & carefull Chriſtians reſiſted and armed the people as they could againſt the danger, then they contriued ſome ſhort article of faith to be learned and held generally and of the ſimpleſt, whereby as it were by one familiar word they might be prepared againſt the infection then ſpreading, & ſo might bee ſufficiently grounded in the trueth. This appeareth to be ſo, not only by the practice of the † ancient Councels, who added to their Creeds words and articles directly againſt the Heretikes who then troubled thē, but euen in this alſo, called the *Apoſtles Creed* it muſt needs be ſo: Seing in the moſte ancient recordes thereof, all the articles are not found full and whole, which

The common Creede not made all at once.

† *In Nic: Conſtant: Epheſ: &c.*

which after were added, but thoſe onely whereof the Churches had need in thoſe former times. And this is one ſure proofe that this common Creede was not made indeed by the Apoſtles thẽ ſelues, becauſe it appeareth (as I ſaid) to haue ben gathered & made parte by part as the after occaſiõs in ỳ Church required. And though it were called the *Apoſtles Creede*, yet that verely was only becauſe it agreeth with the Apoſtles doctrine. Neither could all the Apoſtles cõmunicate togither in making it: Some being preſently dead after Chriſtes aſcenſion, and manie ſcattered farre and wide in the world. And if ſome of them only made it, their names would haue bene recorded. Finally if it had bin made by the Apoſtles in deede, then it had bene *Canonicall* Scripture, as well as the newe Teſtament. But the Creed was neuer ſo iudged nor beleeued to be Canonicall ſcripture. Therefore it was neuer beleeued of old, neither ought it nowe, to be the Apoſtles very making. And yet as I ſaid, we knowe it to be moſt ancient, and very neere to the Apoſtles tymes: yea this very article of Chriſtes *deſcending to Hades*. Becauſe *Ignatius* ſpeaketh of it, & others, as I haue aboue rehearſed.

The Creede was not made by the Apoſtles

Here then, let all men knowe, we denie not this Article of our Creede, but wee embrace it vnfainedly, and doe hold it to haue

haue bene profitably added, when it was firſte put into the Creede, when and by whom ſoeuer it was, ſo that the reaſon and meaninge thereof bee wiſelie and rightly regarded.

No darke no obſcure nor difficulte worde in the vulgare Creede.

And further wee affirme, it hath no darke nor figuratiue meaning nor farre remoued from the vſuall phraſe of the Greeke language wherin it was written, but it hath a plaine eaſie & vulgare ſenſe familiar to the vnderſtanding of all, that ſpake Greeke after the true language. Wherfore it is great iniury now to count vs *Heretikes*, as if wee denied an Article of our faith, for teaching thus much: as ſome more haſtily then wiſely haue pronounced.

Note.

For the right vnderſtanding of this Article, it is neceſſarie to know what Hades in Greeke doeth properly ſignifie

But you will ſaye, What phraſe, what meaning, and what vſe of ſpeach is this that I ſpeake of? Surely it is the proper & vſuall meaning of *Hades* in Greeke that I ſpeake of: that I ſpeciallie require to bee well knowne and regarded: that which in deed openeth the whole preſent controuerſie of Chriſtes deſcending. For this I affirme, it is only the Fathers abuſiue ſpeaking, and altering the vſuall and auncient ſenſe of *Hades*, that hath bred this errour of Chriſtes *deſcending into Hell*: their vnapt & perilous tranſlating it into Latin *Inferi*, & our naughty and corrupt tranſlation in Engliſh *Hell*, hath cõfirmed the ſame. And note here this firſt: It is a thing too rife

Note.

with

with the Fathers, yea with ſome of th
ancienteſt of them to alter and chaung
the authentike vſe of words, whereby co
ſequently it is eaſie for errours and groſ
miſtakings to creepe in. As *Chirotonia* t
ſignifie Ordination of Miniſters, when
ſignifieth authenticallie the Peoples g
uing of voyces in Election: *Klēros* to ſig
nifie only the Clergie, whē it ſignifieth
the Flocke: *Ecclesia* to ſignifie *a Dioceſe* o
Prouince of Chriſtians, whē it is alwayes i
Scripture *a particular Church*, or els in dee
the Vniuerſall Church. So the Latines vſe *M*
ritum to ſignifie *good workes*, which authen
tically ſignifieth *merit* or *deſert*: *Claues* the
Keyes, to ſignifie only *Church-gouernemen*
when in Scripture it ſignifieth always the
whole Miniſteriall power and function,
the worde, *ſacramentes*, and *prayer*, as well a
diſciplme. Euen ſo truely the Greeke Fa
thers vſe *Hades* and the Latin *Inferi*, to ſig
nifie *Hell* properly & patticularly, that is
the place of the Damned: or els an other
particular place vnder the earth a part of
Hell, and not farre from *Hell* it ſelfe, where
Soules remayned if not in paynes yet in
priſon, and farre frō the place of eternall
bleſſednes and ioye: which the later Wri-
ters haue ſince fondlie named *Limbus Pa-
trum*. Thus I ſay haue the Fathers written
and ſpoken, applying *Hades* and *Inferos* ſo
particularlie to the place for Soules vn-
der the earth, farre frō eternal bleſſednes.

Bu

* 1. Pet. 5. 3.

† The dreame of *Limbus Patrum*.

But this is a meere and a plaine abusiō of theſe wordes, and ſpecially of our worde moſt in quæſtion, that is *Hades*. They haue much altered and chāged the authentike and true vſe thereof. The Claſſicall Writers the Maiſters of the Greeke tounge do vſe *Hades* in proper ſenſe only in generall for *the ſtate of the dead, the world of the dead, the world of ſoules departed*, indifferentlie and indefinitelie meaning as well thoſe ineternall ioyes as thoſe in paines. So that they ſignifie herein a generall oppoſition betweene the Liuing & the Dead, not a particular oppoſition betwene the Damned and the Bleſſed. Examples hereof in the authentike greeke Authors are frequent. *Plato* the wiſe Maiſter * ſaieth thus, ſpeaking in the perſon of *Socrates*, a litle before his death: *He pſyche ara, to aidei, to eis toioūton topon heteron oichomeaon, gennaion, kai katharon, kai aidé, eis Hadou, hos aletbōs, para ton agathō kai phronimon Theon: hoi, an Theos ethele, autika kai te heme pſyche iteon.* The ſoule being an inuiſible thing goeth (*hence*) to another place like (*to it ſelfe, that is to*) a noble place, & pure, and inuiſible, euen † vnto the World of the dead, that is in trueth, to the good and wiſe God: whither if God will my ſoule muſt preſentlie goe. This moſte ſingular place ſheweth that *Hades* with them is not properly for *Hell*, but for *the World of the dead*, & ſometime, as namelie here, euen for *Heauen*: and that ſo it is named * *Hades* becauſe it is *aides inuiſible*, or hidden frō our eye & ſenſe in this world. We muſt note then, *Socrates* hopeth not

The true and authentike and familiar ſenſe of Hades.

* *Plato in Phadone.*

† *eis Hadou.*

* *VVhy Hades doth naturally betoken the* World of the Dead.

heere to goe to *Hell*, but to *Heauen* presently after his death : and that is it that he calleth *Hades*. As againe hee affirmeth: *onti esontai en hadou hai psychas hemón*. Our soule after this life shalbee in Hades truely *or* in very truth. Again he saith of Heauē, that it is *aides hades, hósper légetas* : an vnseene Estate, euen Hades * as it is (cōmonly) called. Lastly he speaketh of *ta en Hadou agatha*, of the good thinges in Hades: there is little good in *Hell*. Wherefore it is plaine by Plato, *Hades* sometime may bee vnderstood of *Heauen* : yea and with the Grecians it was a common phrase. Likewise *Plutarch* sheweth of *Leonidas* the Spartan King that most noble defendor of his Countrey, when with a handfull of men he would resist the huge hostes of *Persia*, though he knewe well that himselfe and his were all like to be slaine, as they were in deed, yet hee cheered vppe his men not to feare such a blessed death, saying, *we shall so breake our faste, that wee shall suppe in Hades* not in *Hell*, that were a colde comfort, but *amongst the blessed departed*. So *Homer* saith, †*many noble soules were sent aidi* to *Hades*, not to *Hell*, but to the societie of the happy deceased. And *Stephan** citeth *Plutarch peri tón eusebeón en Hadou*. Concerning the Godlie departed, and beeing in Hades, that is in *Heauen* hee meant, I thinke, not in *Hell*. Therefore the authentike Authours of the Greeke tounge did vse *Hades* for the

* Note, *as it is commonly called.*

In Parall.

† *Iliad. 1.*

* *Steph. Thesaur. in Hades.*

place

place of the blessed soules also, not properlie for *Hell*, the place of the damned, although no man denyeth but † sometime it serueth euen for *Hell* it selfe indeede.

† *And that also euen as well as it is taken for Heauen. For both wayes it is restrayned by a figure: viz. Synecdoche, the whole for the parte.*

This were enough to learned and reasonable men for the cleering of the true and proper sence of *Hades* in Greeke. But because I feare this question will not so quickelie ende, it shall serue very well for the better openinge of the sense of this Greeke worde, if wee compare the Latine worde *Inferi* therewith, which with them was vsed to signifie the same thinge as *Hades* in Greeke did, albeit indeed *Inferi* was not so fit to expresse generally both the blessed and damned dead indifferentlie, as anon God willing wee shall further see.

Nowe firste therefore lett vs compare and consider likewise the authentike and proper vse of *Inferi* the Latine as we haue done of *Hades* the Greeke worde. *Inferi* with the Latines is vsed authentically as we haue seene *Hades* is in Greeke, not for the damned only, but also for the blessed departed this life: indeed generally for the world of the dead, which by death are not cleane extinct but do liue somwhere els in another life. So did *Cicero* meane, * wher he sheweth in latin that incouragment of *Leonidas* before touched to his

The authentike sense of Inferi.

* *Tusul. quæst. 1.*

associates, that they should not feare to dye for their Countrey; *Forti animo esto, nam cænabimus fortè apud inferos*, Be of good cheere (*saide he*) for it is likely wee shall suppe, *where?* in Hell? Nay verily: Neither *Leonidas* nor *Tully* thought so, but rather in a place of eternall blessednesse, where they beleeued the most worthy defendours of their Countrey were receyued, as *Socrates* before saide of himselfe about to dye, *parà ton agathon kai phronimon Theon*, with the good and wise God. Yet this place he nameth here *Inferos*. Hence also it is that *Cicero* sayeth, "It is an Oratours part, sometime *Locupletissimos testes ab inferis excitare*, to rayse vp witnesses from the dead, *not from Hell*. For he meaneth that which himselfe did for *Milos defence, bringing the exãples of the worthy and blessed olde defendors of the common wealth, *Hala Servilius, Nasica, Opimius, C. Marius*, and †*Olde Africanus, Maximus, Paulus, Scipio*, and the twoo *Deci*, whiche woulde greeue at the Common Wealthes calamitie, *whē any going vnto them in illam æternam domum, should tel them of it*. This *eternall habitation* of these most noble dead men called thus to witnesse, was not "*Hell* in his iudgement, yet generallie he reckoned them to bee *apud Inferos*. For so thought and so spake these Heathens: as also *Virgill* doeth, *Deuenere locos lætos, &c.* Where hee describeth *Elysios campos* their *Heauen*, the goodlie Elysian fieldes, the eternall

" *In Brut.*

* *In Orat. prò Milon.*

† *Epist. ad Octav.*

" *Philip. 14.*

Æneid. 6.

ternal habitation of the blessed to be *apud Inferos*, but not in *Hell*, whiche in our Englishe tounge is properly the place of the damned only. Who surely though being a Poet, and fayned manie thinges, yet spake he familiarlie and after the vulgar vse, also for the substaunce of his matter, he vttered touchinge *Heauen* and *Hell* the opinion of the worlde then. Which also *Hortentius* commenting on the same place doeth shewe, saying: *Veteres Elysium putarunt in medio inferorum situm, in quo piorum animæ quiescerēt. Philosophi in Insulis Fortunatis, &c.* The auncient Heathen beleeued their Heauen to bee beneath in the worlde of the dead, where the soules of the godly had rest. The Philosophers thought it to bee in the Fortunat Ilandes, &c. Heerevnto let vs adde, that the latter learned Writers, euen *Christians*, haue also espyed and graunted this propertie of the Latine worde *Infernum* or *inferi*, as also of the Greeke *Hades*. † *Ierome* saith, *Infernus is a place where the soules are included either in rest or paynes.* The old Latin Trāslator vseth *Infernū* not only for *Hades* but also for * *Thanatos death*, also † *Mors* for *Hades*: So he esteemeth *Hades* and *Infernum* (both theis words) for very Death. "*Bucer, Nō aliter vspiam Scriptura de inferno loquitur quā vt sit communis omnibus tam sanctis quam impijs. Gehenna autem solis impijs tribuitur.* The scripture no where speaketh of Hades or Infernum but as beeing common as well to the blessed as to the damned. But Gehenna is proper only for the damned.* *Lauater* saith, *Hades apud Græcos generale vocabulū est.* Hades in Greeke

† In Oso. 13. 14.

* Actes 2. 24.

† 1. Cor. 15. 55.

" In Mat. 27. 50.

* In Ezec. 31. 18.

is a generall worde for the condition of the dead both in tormentes and in peace. * *Bullinger*, To goe *ad inferos*, is To goe into Abrahams bosome: that is, into Heauen, not into Hell. † *Zwinglius*, *Porta inferorum est periphrasis moriendi*. The gates of Death is nothing els but a phrase signifying Death. "*Moller*, touching *Sheol*, *Hades*, and *Infernum*, sayeth, they doe but signifie that Christ dyed. As if he should say, *Ideo lætatus sum quia futurum scio, vt quanquam moriendum mihi sit, tamen in vitam redeam*. Therefore I reioyce because I knowe, that although I dye, yet I shall ryse to life agayne. * *De Mart. Christum descendere ad inferos nihil aliud indicat, nisi quod eundem subijt statum quem reliquæ animæ a corpore seiunctæ experiuntur*. That Christ descended to the dead signifieth nothing els, but that de did vndergoe the same state as other soules doe y depart this life. Thus comparing the Latine *Inferos*, & the Greek *Hades* togither, we see that the ancient and late Authours doe signifie by them both *the generall state of the dead*, *the world of the dead*, conteyning *Heauen* for the blessed, as well as *Hell* for the wicked indifferentlie. Nowe if any maruell at this, and thinke it straunge that *Hades* signifying *a darke place*, and *Inferi* a place *beneath* the earth or in the earth, that these wordes I say should any way signifie *Heauen*, and the blessed soules there. Seeinge all wise men would rather think that this is rather *Hell*, where is vtter darknesse: as for *Heauen* it is certainly a place of glorious brightnes, & that on high, not downwards.

* *Decad. 1.7*

† *In Esa. 38.*

" *In Psal. 16. 10.*

* *In Symb.*

Obiection.

wards. I aunſwere: Here in deede is the verie occaſion of all this error and of all the controuerſie at this day about Chriſts going downe into Hell. I ſay the very miſtaking of theſe wordes is, and hath bene the cauſe of all this. As touching *Hades* al men graunt, it commeth of *a* the Greeke *priuatiue*, and *eido* to ſee. But here is the errour: ſome men take it ſo as betokeninge *impoſsibilitie for vs to ſee* being there, by reaſon of darknes and ougly blacknes in that place: and thē this is likely to be nothing but *Hell*. Nay, they are deceyued that giue this reaſon of the Etymologie of *Hades*, if they giue it for the full, perfect, and generall Etymology, & as being euen with the naturall vſe of the worde. *Plato* * in the place aboue cited, who knew it better thē any of our Contraries, doth giue another and a better meaning of this Deriuation: Where alluding to *hades* he ſaith it is *topos aides* a place inuiſible, a place which here in this worlde none can ſee, an inuiſible world. And ſo *the Worlde of the dead* generally and not only *Hell*, is thereby properly and naturally noted. Which *Tertullian* ‖ expreſſeth thus, *a notitia orbis communis ſegregatum*, remoued from the worldes knowledge. This is certainly the true Deriuation of *Hades*: and ſo it may rightlie, truelie, and by a natural emphaſis ſignifie *Heauen* ſometime, if other Circumſtances there doe ſo require, and not

Answere.

* *In Phadone.*

‖ *Apol. c. 21.*

Hell, as in the former authentike Greeke Testimonies by the very circumstances of the places I haue proued, and euen so also out of question it is taken in *the ground of our controuersie, and in the *Apostles Creede*, where it is said that *Christ being dead went to Hades*, he went to *the World of the dead*, that is namelie to the blessed soules in *Heauen*: I say in *Heauen*, not that *Hades* it selfe doth so importe, but because he that dyed was a Blessed man, But some will say, The reason of the deriuation of *Hades* from *a priuatiue* and *eido*, to see hath bene iudged otherwise, that is for *a place wherin we can not see*, and then it will followe that it should signifie *a darke place*. I denie not but sometime *Hades* may admit that reason of the *Etymologie*, and so the Poet alludeth to it *sine luce domus*, a place without light And thē it signifieth, first *the Graue* where is no light: and by a Metaphore frō hence it may be vsed for *Hell*, wher in reason we iudge also that there is ougly darknes, & no light. Thus I say no man doubteth but *Hades* sometime signifieth: but this is neuer vnles, by a figure *Synecdoche* the whole for the parte, the ful and iust sense thereof by some manifest circumstance be restrayned. The full and iust sense is the generall *state of the dead*, *the world of the dead*, as before I haue shewed: so that it rightlie and properly noteth a difference betwene *the dead* and *the liuing*, not betwene the

*Acts 2.27.

Obiection.

Answere.

Synecdoche.

the *damned* & the *blessed*. And yet it is true this is somtime restrayned as I haue said, by the circumstances in the place where we find it: and then it is sometime for the place of the body being dead, sometime of the soule departed being in Hell: and sometime also for the place of soules in Heauen, as I haue declared before also. So that aboue all things this is to be noted and to bee taken heede of, that wee restraine not this generall worde *Hades*, where it neede not to be restrayned: and moste of all that wee take it not for *Hell*, where it may, nay where it must signifie *Heauen*, as in the places of this our maine controuersie aforesaid. Note.

Howbeit notwithstãding all this, compare the Latin *Infere* with the Greek *Hades*, and then I graunt *Infere* is proner to bring vs into errour then *Hades*. For it is true *Infere* commeth of *Infra* which is *beneath*: and therfore it seemeth there is no other way but to take it for a place *beneath* the earth, or in the earth, and not on high, where it is to be thought that *Heauen* is & the blessed soules doe dwell. All this is true in deed: yet let vs heedfullie note notwithstanding, that this worde *Infere* in Latin vse doeth comprehend all that *Hades* in Greeke doeth: euen *the whole state* or *World of the dead* generally, making * oppositiõ properlie betwene *Superstites* and *Defunctos*, the Liuing and the Dead (as before was saide of *Hades*)

It is easie to slip into errour by the vse of ỹ Latin Inferi *or* Infernum *in the Creede, vnles we carefullie consider the ancient vse thereof.*

Note.

* *Bulling Dec. 1. 7.*

Hades) without difference of the bleſſed and damned, vnleſſe alſo ſome other reaſon and circumſtance doe reſtrayne the words ancient & proper generalitie. The plaine reaſon of this, we may learne from *Cicero* him ſelf, Saith he [a] "That *Inferi* ſhould ſignifie the ſtate of al the dead both good and bad generallie, it grew of an error of the Auncients, *in terram cadentibus corporibus hiſq; humo tectis, ſub terra eenſebant reliquam vitam agi mortuorum.* The old ſimple ignorant Latines thought *when the bodyes of men were layed in the earth, their ſoules alſo lived the reſt of their life vnder the earth.* This they thought of all the dead, both the Bleſſed and the Damned. And this, ſayeth hee, they thought becauſe they knewe not in deede of the ſoules of the dead *quâ in ſede manerent*, in what place they were after death: *Cuius ignoratio* ſaith he further, *finxit Inferos, eosq; formidines, &c.* The ignorance of trueth herein, begat this opinion that the ſtate and Worlde of the Dead was vnder the earth; *and particularly* the terrours of Hell alſo. And ſo in deed not the opinion only, but the phraſe alſo whereby they ſignified this general ſtate and World of the Dead, was iuſtly & moſt fitlie, as they thought, from *Infra* beneath, *viz. inferi* and *infernus*. And ſo they ſpake alſo *excitare ab inferis*, to raiſe vp, not from Hell, but generally and indifferentlie from the Dead: *migrare ad inferos* to goe to the dead, common as well to thoſe whom they beleeued to bee Bleſſed, as to the Damned. Alſo thus they beleeued *E-*

[a] *Tuſcul. quæſt. 1.*

lyſium

ipsos campos esse apud inferos, the Elysian fields (namely the Gentils Heauen) to bee *beneath* amongst the dead: as alreadie I haue shewed out of *Virgil*, *Cicero*, &c. Now *Tully* further sayth of this opinion, *Quam eorum opinionem magni errores consecuti sunt*: This opinion gaue occasion of many and great errours. In all which wordes of *Cicero* I note 3. things. 1. That he vtterly misliked this opinió of ỹ old Latines or whomsoeuer, that thought ỹ World of the dead was vnder the earth, and therfore gaue this terme *Inferi* to signifie the same. This he openly misliketh, yea that the damned Soules were *beneath* in the earth, or at least such kinde of torments for thé as consequently the former errour did cause many to imagine. Howe much more did hee condemne them that thought al ỹ deceased soules were *beneath*, *vnder*, or *in* ỹ earth? The blessed he thought rather, as *Plato* did, to asceád vp to the heauens. Here we must note that the Heathé held diuersly of their *Heauen*, the place for the blessed soules. † Some thought it in the Heauens *aboue*, some in the *ayer*, some in the *Sphere of the moone*, and others as before we heard in the *fortunate Ilandes*, and many, specially the common sort, & most speciallie in the olde times long before, that it was an other Region *vnder* the earth, as *Hell* it selfe also was one, but this cleane distinct & remoued frō that which they called **Elysium*, as before I obserued

Touching Inferi in Cicero 3 things to bee noted.

† *As Tertull. sheweth: in lib. de Anima.*

**Their Heauen.*

our

out of *Virgill*. This last opinion that the soules deceased were *vnder* the earth Calvin heere flatly reiecteth. 2. I note in him that although he reiected this olde fabulous opinion of the Latines, yet he retayned the *Latine phrase* as being now cómon and familiar euery where, *ad inferos, apud inferos* generally for *the worlde of the dead*. Which phrase arose of old from that opinion, as namely, thinking all the dead after this life to be *infra beneath*. He had learned to thinke wiselyer, but yet hee spake so as the vulgar phrase had preuailed. Accordding to * *Aristotles* rule, *Loquendum vt vulgus, sapiendum vt sapientes*, we must speake as the custome is, but beleeue as the wise doe. So then yet this phrase of speech remayned cómon, though the ground of it euen then was held fabulous of diuers. 3. *Tully* saith, of this opinion *followed manie errours*. Now as hee saith from this opinion amongst the Heathen, So I say, from this *phrase of speech Inferi* receaued amongst Christians, but first grouded on the heathnish opinion, there hath followed many errors in the Church. For this worde *Inferi* beeing vsed amongst the Christians vulgarly and familiarly, but taken from the Heathen, and the reason thereof not duely considered whence it first arose, namely that it was an error to thinke the soules of the dead were *vnder* the earth: likewise also the Greeke worde *Hades*, when men mistooke

* Topic.

Note.

The Fathers not duely considering the right vse of Inferi & Hades, *gaue occasion of the errours at this day about* Hell *and* Death.

tooke the *Etymologie* of it as meaning *a darke place*, whérather it betokeneth *a place inuisible to vs heere*, as before I haue ſhewed: I ſay both theſe miſtakeings amongſt the Fathers preuailing, haue geuen occaſion both to them and vs ſince of greate and grieuous errors, & of all this contention in the Church heerebout at this day. To remedy the which, doubtles the beſt way is well and throughly to conſider the authentike vſe of theſe words *Hades* & *Infernus*, in ſuch ſorte as before I haue declared. And then this will appeare that our Engliſh word *Hell* which we commonly vſe for the former Greeke and Latine, it fitteth not, it differeth greatly, it is much amiſſe. And ſpecially it ſerueth not for *Hades*, as before I haue ſhewed. For *Hades* ſignifieth *an inuiſible place*, and is vſed authentically for the *Worlde of the dead* in generall, *the inuiſible World vnknowne to vs heere*, So that it makes difference not betwene the damned and bleſſed, as ſome ſuppoſe, but betwene the dead and the liuing: but *Hell* in Engliſh is properly and onely the place of eternal torments for the wicked.

Hell in Engliſh no fit worde to expreſſe the Greeke Hades.

Thus hitherto by comparing alſo the Latine *Infers* and the Greeke *Hades* togeather, we ſee now cleerly what the authentike vſe of *Hades* is. And ſeeing we ſee it, I inferre & affirme boldly, Euen ſo doubtleſſe doe the Scriptures ſpeake, ſo write the Apoſtles, yea the Septuagint Tranſlators,

* Good Grammarians.

lators, & all * good Grecians: they varie not their language frō the vſual, known currant ſpeech which was ſpoken in before their times. And if ſo they do, then it remayneth concluded and firmly proued that the Scripturs by *Hades* meane not *Hell* properly: but the *World of the Dead* indifferently, or the general ſtate of *death*, or the *Power of death*, vnleſſe ſometime where ſpecial circumſtāces do reſtraine proper & natiue generality of that word.

Obiection.

But yet this is doubted ſtil by ſome, that denie flatlie the newe Teſtament to haue vſed *Hades* anie other way then only for *Hell*.

Answere.

Theſe men, what ſhould I ſaye to them? You haue heard that the naturall propertie of the word *Hades*, according to the vſe of the authentike Authours, (by whom euen the Apoſtles wordes muſt be Grammaticallie conſtrued, I ſuppoſe) plainlie refuteth them. Wherefore I conſtantlie affirme as before, the Scripture vſeth *Hades* neuer properly for *Hell*. And this I affirme not onely becauſe of the former authentike conſent with mee about the worde, but alſo becauſe all the ſeuerall places, eight in number, where *Hades* is vſed in Scripture, beeing well conſidered, they ſhewe the ſame manifeſtlie: alſo for that the *Seauentie* Interpretours doe vſe it ſo too, and finally becauſe *Sheol* in Hebrewe, whiche all men know

The Scripture hath Hades in 8. places.

know to be the ſame that the Greeke *Hades* is, ſignifieth likewiſe ſo too.

And firſte that we may viewe the ſeuerall places of Scripture, and ſo not be deceiued: 1. Thus we read **The gates of Hades ſhall not preuayle againſt the Church*; Hee ſpeaketh heere of perſecution and ſuffering death for the faith of Chriſt. But ſayeth hee, This ſhall not preuayle againſt you: What? *Death* and *Deſtruction* ſhall not. So that the *gates of Hades* heere are nothing els but the *gates of Death*, the *power of Death*, ſhall neuer preuayle, though they aſſayle you. And this phraſe ſeemes to bee taken from the vſe of the Iewes, who executed their ſeuere iudgementes of life and death in the *gates* of their Cities. Hence the phraſe ſeemeth to come, "*The gates of Death*, for the power of thoſe Rulers whiche ſhould † condemne to death the godlie for their faith and a good conſcience, and yet not preuayle. That wee ſhould tranſlate heere, the *gates of Hell*, meaning directlie *vices*, and *ſinnes*, and *errours*, as ſome of the ancient Writers doe, the circumſtances of the Text doe ſeeme not to beare it. For by occaſion, as ſeemeth of the "former incouragmẽt to his faithfull and godly ones, he falleth to tell them of his owne ſufferings at Ieruſalem ſoone after, where though hee ſhould be betrayed and ſlayne, yet ſhoulde hee riſe

* Mat. 16. 18.

" By a Metonymie.

† *Except wee eſteeme it but as a ſimple Hebraiſme, as Iſa. 38. 10. Where the gates of Sheol is nothing els but Death, or the power and ſtrength of Death.*

" ver. 21.

riſe againe the third day, as it were giuing them an example and that firſt of all in himſelfe of that combate and victorie which * before he promiſeth them, & incourageth them vnto. So then he doth not heere directlie and ſpeciallie arme them, nor promiſeth cõqueſt againſt the temptations of *ſinne*, though by proportion that alſo followeth from this place: but he encorageth his to ſtande to their faith manfully againſt all perſecutours, ſeeing all their rage ſhould not preuaile, nor *death* it ſelfe which ſhould bee adiudged vnto them in *the gates*, albeit it afflict them. Againe *the gates of Hades ſhall not preuaill*, theſe words doe manifeſtly pretend force and violence againſt them, which yet ſhould not get the victory ouer them. But errours and ſinnes though by them Sathan ſet vpon vs, yet they alwayes pretend contentment and quiet eaſe toward vs, not force and violence, as the rage of perſecutors doth, & as heere in this text is plainly ſignified. Wherfore heere ſurely † *the gates of Hades* meaneth the power of death and deſtruction & nothing els properly. Neither alſo that the power of theſe Tyrantes ſhould be called the *gates of Hell* doe I ſee any reaſon: their Power is from God, and not from Hell. Their malice moueth not Gods children, but only as it threatneth Death. Therfore to call it heere *the gates of death* it is good reaſon,

* verſe 18.

† Zwing. in Iſa. 38. & others pag. 102.

ſon, & not the gates of Hell, † as is aboue ſaid. Howbeit if anie will vrge the common tranſlation, and ſay *the gates of Hell*, let him know this interpretation is receiued among the learned not for the proprietie of the word *Hades*, but for "a circumſtãce of the text heere requiring, it to be ſo trãſlated, as they conceaue. And I confeſſe that ſo here it may be, and doe ſhew that thus this *Hades* is ſomeryme vſed: and namely in the laſt example following out of *Luke* Chap. *16.23*. Yet properlie *Hades* is nothing els but *the Vnſeene Worlde of the Dead*, not *Hell*. 2. Our preſent place chiefflie in quæſtion is to be noted. * *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule (in Hades) with the dead*, or *in the Vnſeene worlde of the dead: nor ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption*. Our common tranſlation hath it, *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in the graue, &c.* which is not much amiſſe, conſidering the ſcope of the Apoſtle and the maner of phraſe both in Hebrue and in Greeke ſometime, that is by a figure *Synecdoche*, the whole for the parte: as before I noted ſometime it may bee. But ſeeing a figure heere needs not, the moſt plaine, & moſte naturall, and familiar tranſlation ſhuld be thus, as I haue noted: Thou wilt not leaue *my ſoule amongſt the dead*, nor ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption. 1. That this is the natural and proper ſenſe of *Hades*, we haue ſeene enough alreadie by the authentike Greeke writers. 2. That the

† *That is, regarding it as it indeede toucheth vs.*

" *Namely, becauſe this malice and rage of perſecutors proceedeth from Hell, and it ſtirred vp by all the power and might of Satan*

* *Act. 2. 27. taken out of Pſa. 16. 10.*

Seauentie vse it so to, after whose translation & phrase *Peeter* heere speaketh: and that the Hebrue word *Sheol* which is the originall of this phrase hath the same sense likewise anon herafter we shall make manifest, God willing. But to translate this *Hell* as some now wil haue it, that is openlie wrong and iniurious to the text. And thus I proue it: First "*Dauid* speaketh it in some sorte as true of † him selfe, being a type and figure of Christ, whom in deede in more speciall wise it concerned. Again *Peter* in this point for the which he citeth this verse of the *Psalme*, *doeth plainlie graunt all this of *Dauid* aswell as of *Christ*, sauing that *Dauid* was left therin euen till this day, which *Christ* was not. But this is only *the state of death*, and *the graue* whiche *Dauid* is yet left in, not *Hell* in any wise, yea he was neuer in *Hell*. Therefore *Hades* and *Sheol* here can not be for *Hell*. Secondlie, if it bee altogeather heere from the purpose of *Peter* to speake to the Iewes of Christes *soule* being in *Hell*, then there is no reason to take these wordes *Hades* and *Sheol* heere for *Hell*. But by the " whole text it is euident, *Peter* had no reason nor purpose to speake to these Iewes of Christes *Soule* being in *Hell*. His vvhole direct purpose was to shewe them of his *Soule being amongest the dead*, and his *body in the graue*, like as other men are when they dy,

" Psal. 16. 10.

† *Bulling. Decad. 1. 7.*

* Act. 2. 39.

" Acts 2.

and

and was from thence mightily rayſed vp agayne, more then other men were or could bee. Therefore *Hades* and *Sheol* heere doe ſignifie the *ſtate of death*, and not *Hell*. The firſte *propoſition* ſtandeth on plaine and manifeſte reaſon, ſpeciallie ſeeing theſe are the very wordes that hee "preſſeth and ſtandeth on, to ſhewthem "verſe 31. howe Chriſt beeing *truely dead*, was yet riſen agayne. And as toneching the *aſſumption*, that is moſt apparaunt, *Peter* had no reaſon in the worlde, and therefore no purpoſe to ſpeake to theſe Iewes of Chriſtes *Soule being in Hell*. 1. They being incredulous and vnbeleeuing. 2. The thing beeing inuiſible and ſtraunge, and vncouth, not ſubiect to the ſenſe, and without all example of the like. 3. Hee intending nothing els in all this ſpeech to them, but to teache that this IESVS whom they had ſlayne, was not *nowe dead*, but riſen agayne, why ſhould hee nowe ſpeake of *Hell*: What reſon had hee? If Chriſt had bene in *Hell*, it made not neceſſarilie neither for his *death*, nor *reſurrection*, whiche was the onely ſcope of his ſpeech (verſe 31.) but being an vncouth and inuiſible thing, it might rather hinder their faith, then further it. Therefore verilie *the ſtate of death* is all that *Hades* and *Sheol* doe heere ſignifie: and it is the whole and onely purpoſe of *Peter* heere ſo to teſtifie.

3. † *One sitteth on a pale horse whose name was death, and Hades followed after him.* That is, *the worlde of the dead, Regnum mortuorum.* If you referre it only to our bodyes, then it may be the *graue.* But rather I take it generally for *the state of the dead* after this life. It can not be *Hell* certely: because the text addeth *Power was giuen them to slaye with the sword, and with famine, and death, and with wilde beastes. Hell* slayeth none in that sort. Again it is said, they had *power, on the fourth parte of the worlde.* But to say precisely that the *fourth parte of the worlde* at any time should goe to *Hell,* I take it to be a strange phrase in the Scripture. In a worde this place is nothing els but a propheſie of great mortalitie that at a certen time should come vpon the world for the contempt of the Gospell, & that they should dye by such meanes as are there specified. Wherein *Hell* dealeth not, neither sheweth any *power.* Therefore *Hades* heere can not be *Hell.*

† Apoc. 6. 8.

4. " *Death and Hades,* (that is *the place* or *world of the dead,* or *the kingdome and power of death*) *were cast into Hell.* It were absurde to saye, *Death and Hell* were cast into *Hell:* and therefore so we saye also in the verse before, *Death* and *the World of the Dead, rendred vp their dead to iudgment.* 5. *O Death, where is thy victorie? O Hades, where is thy stinge?* Neither can this be meant of *Hell:* because al his speech heere is of the *resurrection from*

" Apoc. 20. 14.

* 1. Cor. 15. 55.

the

the dead, and this very ſpeech is an * inſulting & triumph, as it were, ouer *Death* & *the power of Death*: ſeeing they ſhall not be able to holde them, whom they ſhall gett into their power. As for *Hell*, that would not bee aduerſarie to the *reſurrection*, but would deſire it rather, as being greedie of the bodyes alſo of the damned which thó it ſhould haue togither with their ſoules, and not before. He ſpeaketh not then of the damnation of the wicked, but of the Reſurrection of the dead. Note alſo, hee doeth plainlie allude to that of the Prophet † Oſe *Sheol, O graue*, or *O worlde of the dead, I wilbe thy deſtruction*. Not *Hell*: for the Prophet ſpeaketh to comforte Iſraell in their captiuitie, where though they were for their rebellion againſt God deſtroyed grieuouſlie a longe time, yet at length hee promiſeth to ſtaye his iudgements, & *Death* ſhould not deuoure them anie more, it ſhould not haue her former power vpon Gods people, but they ſhuld liue and floriſhe againe, if they repented. And this the Apoſtle might very fitlie allude vnto, when he ſpake of the *reſurrection*, which might be notably compared to Iſraels returne out of the * pitt of miſerie in *Babilons* Captiuitie. But of *hell* there could be no direct nor proper meaning, neither in th'one nor th'other. 6. † *I haue the Keyes of Hades and of Death*: That is nothing els but Chriſt, who was dead, hath

* *Death is ſwallowed vp in victory.* ver. 54.

† Oſ. 13. 14.

* *Lacus Zech.* 9. 11.

6. † Rev. 1. 8.

3. † *One sitteth on a pale horse whose name was death, and Hades followed after him.* That is *the worlde of the dead, Regnum mortuorum.* If you referre it only to our bodyes, then it may be the *graue.* But rather I take it generally for *the state of the dead* after this life. It can not be *Hell* certely: because the text addeth *Power was giuen them to slaye with the sword, and with famine, and death, and with wilde beastes. Hell* slayeth none in that sort. Again it is said, they had *power, on the fourth parte of the worlde.* But to say precisely that the *fourth parte of the worlde* at any time should goe to *Hell,* I take it to be a strange phrase in the Scripture. In a worde this place is nothing els but a propheſie of great mortalitie that at a certen time should come vpon the world for the contempt of the Gospell, & that they should dye by such meanes as are there specified. Wherein *Hell* dealeth not, neither sheweth any *power.* Therefore *Hades* heere can not be *Hell.*

† Reu. 6. 8.

4. "*Death and Hades,* (that is *the place or world of the dead,* or *the kingdome and power of death*) *were cast into Hell.* It were absurde to saye, *Death and Hell* were cast into *Hell:* and therefore so we saye also in the verse before, *Death* and *the World of the Dead, rendred vp their dead to iudgment.* 5. *O Death, where is thy victorie? O Hades, where is thy stinge?* Neither can this be meant of *Hell:* because al his speech heere is of the *resurrection from*

" Reu. 20. 14.

* 1. Cor. 15. 55

the

the dead, and this very ſpeech is an * inſulting & triumph, as it were, ouer *Death* & *the power of Death*: ſeeing they ſhall not be able to holde them, whom they ſhall gett into their power. As for *Hell*, that would not bee aduerſarie to the *reſurrection*, but would deſire it rather, as being greedie of the bodyes alſo of the damned which thé it ſhould haue togither with their ſoules, and not before. He ſpeaketh not then of the damnation of the wicked, but of the Reſurrection of the dead. Note alſo, hee doeth plainlie allude to that of the Prophet † Oſe *Sheol, O graue*, or *O worlde of the dead, I wilbe thy deſtruction*. Not *o Hell*: for the Prophet ſpeaketh to comforte Iſraell in their captiuitie, where though they were for their rebellion againſt God deſtroyed grieuouſlie a longe time, yet at length hee promiſeth to ſtaye his iudgements, & *Death* ſhould not deuoure them anie more, it ſhould not haue her former power vpon Gods people, but they ſhuld liue and floriſhe againe, if they repented. And this the Apoſtle might very fitlie allude vnto, when he ſpake of the *reſurrection*, which might be notably compared to Iſraels returne out of the * pitt of miſerie in *Babylons* Captiuitie. But of *hell* there could be no direct nor proper moaning, neither in th'one nor th'other. 6. † *I haue the Keyes of Hades and of Death*: That is nothing els but Chriſt, who was dead, hath

* *Death is ſwallowed vp in victory. ver. 54.*

† *Oſe. 13. 14.*

* *Lacus Zech. 9. 11.*

6.

† *Rev. 1. 8.*

nowe *ouercome* death, and hath *power to dye no more*. He hath ouercome death & holdeth the power thereof for him ſelfe and others. For him ſelfe, in that hee can and will dye no more. For others, in that hee can giue to death whom he will, & whom he will he ſaueth. This therfore is a plain oppoſition to his former ſtate when hee was in *death*, but nowe ſhalbe ſo *no more*: and nothing els, as the beginning of the verſe hanging togither with this, doeth expreſſe. *I liue, but was dead, and* (nowe) *beholde I liue for euer, and I haue the Keyes of Hades and of Death*. As if hee ſhould ſaye: I am hencefoorth *no more* ſubiect, but ſuperior therevnto. Heere is nothing of *Hell*.

7. * Mat. 11. 23. 7. * *And thou Capernaum which art lift vp to the Heauen, ſhalt be brought downe to deſtruction, to Hades.* He ſpeaketh heere of the deſtruction of the Citie and people thereof, which he calleth *Hades*. And this is manifeſt: 1. By the notable Oppoſitiō of their lifting *lifting vp to the heauen*, and their *bringing down to Hades*. In the 1. he meaneth not that they were lift vp to eternall bleſſednes, but only that they were lift vp in renowme, in pompe, & in flouriſhing ſtate, according as ỳ Latins ſpeak alſo *ad ſydera tolli*, To be exalted to the ſkye. Wherefore in the later he meaneth they ſhalbe *brought downe to deſtruction*, to haue *no being* ingloriouſlie: that is *Hades* heere in this place, but not *Hell*. 2. This is alſo manifeſt in ỳ he ſaieth pre-

preſẽtly of *Sodom*, whervnto here he cõpareth *Capernaũ*, if they had had the meanes of repẽtãce in ſuch maner as *Capernaũ had*, *Sodom had remayned to this day*. This ſheweth he ſpake but of *Capernaums deſtruction*, & of her *not being* on the earth: and not of their *damnation* in hell by the word *Hades*.

8. This remayneth only, **The rich man †in the ſtate of Death*, or *in the world of the Dead, liſted vp his eyes being in torments*: Thus I ſay we may trãſlate it, *in the world of the dead*, or *being amongſt the dead, he liſt vp his eyes, &c.* And thẽ there is no text in all ỹ Bible where *Hades* ſignifieth *Hel* neceſſarily. But if we graunt to ſay *Hell* in this place for *Hades*, yet we affirme, this ſenſe is giuẽ it for other circũſtances, not for ỹ nature of the word. Becauſe he was *ſuch a man*, and becauſe it is ſtraight expreſſed *he was in tormentes beeing dead*. Therefore to be in *Hades*, to be in *the the World of the Dead*, that was to *him* in deed to be in *Hell*. As for *Hell* in the Scripture it hath another word *Gehenna* which properlie ſignifieth it. As †*Iuſt. Martyr* obſerueth, *he de Gehenna eſti topos entha kolázeſthai mellous si hoi adikòs biósantes*, Gehenna Hell is a place where the wicked ſhalbe tormented. Wherby is inſinuated that *Hades* is not properly *Hell*, which *Gehenna* is properly for. And thus Mr *Bucer* excellently obſerueth not only in that †before cited, but alſo on *Luk*, **Diues nõ ſimpliciter ſcribitur eſſe* en hade, *ſed & in Gehẽná, quia in tormentis & flamma*. The riche man is not ſaide to be ſimply in *Hades*, but alſo in Hell: becauſe he is ſaid to be in fyry torments.

8.

*Luke 16. 23. † in Hades.

† *Iuſt. Mart. Apol. 2.*

† Pag. 101. * in Luke. 16. 26.

Hades *and* Gehẽna *which in the Scripture is only for Hell, are not all one.*

Therefore *Hades* and *Gehenna* are not properly all one: and wherſoeuer *Hades* is for *Hell*, there it is taken by a figure *ſynecdoche* the whole for the parte, the inuiſible ſtate of the dead for that where the damned are in torments. Thus then *Hades* in ſcripture is no where properly for *Hell*.

The Septuagints doe vſe Hades after the ſenſe of the authentike Greeke.

Which alſo is further to be declared by the 70. Tranſlatours. Whoſe wordes and phraſes the Apoſtles themſelues vſed and chiefly followed in all their allegationes from the old Teſtament. So that their vſing of Greeke wordes and phraſes muſt needs bee of greate authority. Theſe put *Hades* generally after the authentike vſe for *Death*, the *ſtate of the dead*: as *His ſoule draweth neere to the graue, and he zoe autou en hade*: his life is amonge the dead, *or* in the world of the dead. And *paroikeſe to Hade he pſyke mou*. My ſoule had dwelt in the world of the dead. In Hebrue it is *Dumah* in ſcilence, that is *in the eſtate of death*. Againe *ouk hoi nekroi aineſouſi ſe, oude hoi pantes katabainontes eis Hadou*. The dead praiſe thee not, o Lord, nor any that goe doune to the ſtate of the dead. Here alſo in Hebrue it is *dumah* to the place *of ſilence*. Further "what man liueth, and ſhall not ſee death, *ruſetai ten pſychen autou ek cheiros Hadou*? ſhall he deliuer his Soule from the power of the Vnſeene world, *that is* from death? And My ſoule was filled with ſorrowes, *kai he zoe mou to Hade engiſen*. And my life drew neere vnto the Dead, or to the worlde of the Dead. And *Iob* ſaith, *Hades mou ho oikos*: The World of the Dead ſhalbe my habitation. In all theſe places and in many other ſuch like

* Iob. 33. 22.

† Pſ. 94. or after the Greeke 93. ver. 17.

†† Pſa. 113. or 115. ver. 17.

* Pſal. 88. 49.

* pſa. 78. 3.

‡ Iob. 17. 13.

of

of the 70. *Hades* can not be *hell*: but the *state* or *world of the dead*. Finallie consider the Hebrue word *Sheol*: Al men will graũt that *Sheol* in Hebrue and *Hades* in Greeke, as *here they are vsed for the same thihg, so in deed euery where els they are *all one*. That is out of question. But it is manifest in the Scripture that *Sheol* is generally vsed for the *state of the death*, the *worlde of the dead*, and speciallie sometime for the *soule*, sometime for the *body*, sometime for the *good*, sometime for the *bad*, according as the circumstances doe imply: but alwayes for their *state in death*, and no further *properlie*. And because it commeth of *Shaal*, to *craue or aske*, it signifieth that this *Worlde* or *state of the dead*, though it takes infinite, yet it † still taketh, and is neuer satisfied. Neither ought any man to doubt that *Sheol* hath this familiar, ordinarie, and natural signification, to note as I saide generallie *the state of death*. There are innumerable places of Scripture that doe euince it, and chieflie that it is not *properlie* Hell. Firste that where Iacob sayeth of Ioseph whom he thought to be dead, "*Ered el bens abel Sheolah*, I will goe downe mourning vnto my sonne to the place of the dead. Questionles hee meant not into *Hell*, but into *the place of the dead* that were dead *in the Lorde*. Also Ezechia thought he should haue gone ‡ *beshagnare Sheol*, to the gates of death. He thought not that he should haue gone to Hell, but to the *state*

The Hebrue Sheol *signifieth the Estate of death, or the World of death likewise, as hath bene seene in* Hades.

* *Ps.16.10.*

Shaal.

† *Abac.2.5. Kishol veeammaueth, velo iishbahh. Also Pro.30.16. 27.20.*

Sheol *not for Hell properly, but for the generall estate of Death.*

" *Gen.37.35.*

† *Isa.38.10*

state of Death. And * *Lo sheol todhecha*, The world of the Dead doeth not confesse thee, Death can not praise thee, They that goe downe to the pitt can not hope for thy trueth. All this is meant not of the damned in *Hell*, but of them in the *state of death*. So †*Bisheol* is *in the World of the dead*, or *in the state of Death:* which the coherēce doth proue, which is betwene " *hammethim* the dead, and this here. Againe, * *O that thou wouldest hide me in the World of the dead, bisheol:* Iob would not desire to be in *Hell:* and he sayeth, the like shall come to him selfe " *Sheol bethi* My house shalbe the place of the dead: and all my hopes of recouery in this world, shall goe downe with me †*badde sheol* to the *strong place of the world of the Dead. Howbeit Iob was not so faithlesse as to thinke he should goe to *Hell.* Again † I will redeeme them *mijad Sheol*, from the power of Death: *Sheol* o Death, *or* o kingdome of Death I will bee thy destruction. This hath bin shewed* before to be spokē directly & ꝓperly of the state of Death, or ẏ power of Death, not of Hell. Which the olde Latin trāslator doth also wel " obserue, who turneth † it *à Morte, frō Death:* again * both *inferne* & " *ô Mors*, that is, *o Death*. Further let it be noted ẏ in *Dauid*, whose phrasewe are now a skāning of, ther is no word almost more cōmon then †*Sheol* in this sense: and specially there it is seene, where he expreslie referreth it to the Soule. The same also **Iob* meaneth, where he speaketh of †*Beth mogned lecol chai*, the House appointed for al the liuing. Thus therefore it is manifest that *Sheol* in Hebrue is not properly *Hell*, but it is *the*

* verse 18.
† Ecclesiastes 9. 10.
" verse. 3.
* Iob 14. 13.
" Chap. 17. 13.
* verse 16.
* *or els, on the Beere to the graue.*
† Hose 13. 14.
* Pag. 117.
" Hose 13. 14
† *mijad Sheol.*
* Hos. 13. 14.
" 1. Cor. 15. 55.
† Psal. 89. 49. and 88. 4. and 18. 6. and 16. 10. &c.
* Iob. 30. 23.
† He meaneth *Sheol.*

World of the Dead, or *the state of Death* simply and indifferently. Whiche sense the *Seauentie* doe plainlie confirme also: who sometime translate *Sheol*, Death: * *Misheol ek thanatou* from Death, not from Hell, and somtime where they turne *Sheol Hades*, yet it is moste euident and vndenyable that very Death, or the estate of Death, or the power of Death is there meant: as in all those places wherin we spake of *Sheol* immediarly before. Therfore the 70. vnderstand *sheol* and *hades* also for *the state of death* simply & generally, not for *Hell* properly. Euen altogether after ỹ natural propertie of the word with the authētike Grecians, as reason is that they should. Thus there is no question then, but *hades & sheol* being all one, & namely with the 70. who do almost alwayes vse ỹ one for the other, that therfore *Hades* & *Sheol* both do not signifie *Hell* properly, but *the state of Death, the World or place of the dead, such as are gon out of this visible World into another*. Also where *hades* and *sheol* are more specially taken for ỹ † *Graue* or *the state of dead Bodyes*, euen heere *in effect* it is all one as before, they signifie *the state of Death*: it is not possible ỹ they should be for *Hell properly & primarily* in any of these and infinite more such like places. Which besides all the former, "*M. Bucer* sheweth excellently: Sheol Hades & Infernum in Scripture do alwayes signifie the Graue, & so the state of ỹ Dead whatsoeuer it bee either happy or cursed. And *Tremell. This Hebrue word Sheol doth signifie any station or state of the dead in generall: and Hell it may sometime signifie but by a figure synecdoche.

* Prov. 23.14

Note.

† Gen 42.38. 1. King. 2.9. Isa. 14.10. cõpared with 11 Eze. 32.21.27 Ion. 2.2. &c.

" *Omnino sheol id quod Graeci ton Haden, Latini infernũ reddere solent, in Scripturis sepulchrum atque inde statum mortuorum significat qualiscunque sit vel fœlix vel infœlix. In Luk. 16.16.*

* *Sheol vox Hebræa statienem quamlibet mortuorum in vniuersum notat. In Psal. 49.15.*

Now

Now then seeing the authentike Greeians do vse *Hades* for *the inuisible World* after this life, that is for *the World of the dead*, yea *Inferi* in Latine is taken so to as wee haue seene, and seing the new Testament hath *Hades* sundry times in like sence, and the 70. interpreters before them, & seing the Hebrue *Sheol* whiche they make to be and is indeed al one with *Hades*, *may and doth signifie also *the Vnseene worlde*, that is *the World of the dead generally*. Therefore it followeth that in our Creed also *Hades* is lyable to this sense, and for the force of the worde there is no cause to translate it *Hell*, and the Fathers by meere mistaking the proper & true vse of this worde haue fancyed such diuers and vaine thinges, which fooliſh children haue since amplified, of Christs *going downe to Hell in his Soule after death*, as neither themselues knewe, neither can they declare to others.

* *Which is so infinitly wide and large, that it is neuer full.*

Obiection.

But now it will be obiected, how then should wee translate the Hebrue and the Greeke *Sheol* & *Hades*, to fit those words in our language. It is true indeede, through the scarcitie of our toung it is most hard to fitte a translation in English to those words of [a] Scripture. But this is euident, that which is commonly vsed & namely in our vulgare Creedes, *Hell*, is a word to partiall, to vnfitt, yea corrupt, and starke nought. It is suteable to the largenes of the Hebrue and Greeke meaning, though

Answere.

[a] *Psa.16.10. Act.2.27. and in other places.*

The English word Hell *is not good in the Creede.*

not

not ſo iuſte with the Nature of our worde, to ſay in Engliſh, *the Dead.* As in the Creede, † *He went vnto the Dead:* or, *Hee deſcended among the Dead.* Alſo " *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule with the Dead, nor thy holye one to ſee corruption.* Which as I haue ſhewed before, is the true, plaine, eaſie, familiar, and cõmon ſenſe of *Hades* among the authentike Greekes: as alſo of *Sheol* in Hebrue.

† Or if you will, ſay thus: Hee went into the vnſeene world &c.

" *Act.2.27. Pſa.16.10.*

But to tranſlate thus, is to depart from the Fathers ſenſe of *Hades:* they vſe it alwayes or moſt commonly for *Hell.* They vſe it indeed commonly, eyther for *Hell* it ſelfe, or for a place of darkeneſſe, a parte of *Hell*, far from the place of *Bleſſednesſe.* And yet they graunt alſo, that it may bee (yea and *Infers* to) vſed for *Abrahams boſom*, where Lazarus *had ioy*, and where was *a great diſtance* & contrariety betweene *Hell and it.* What may this be, but the place of *bleſſednes*, I thinke, euen in their iudgements? How ſoeuer it be, we ſtand not vpon the Fathers language to tranſlate the Scriptures, or this Article of our Creede. The Apoſtles and Apoſtolike men as alſo the Septuagint to, did write and ſpeake as the authentike Grecians did, as they learned to ſpeake of the Maiſters of that tounge, and as the people then might beſt vnderſtand, not making phraſes, nor fitting their wordes to the latter writers that ſpake and wrote long ſince them. Therefore according to the authentike

Obiection.

Anſwer.

vſe

vſeof *Hades*, ſo ought we indeede to tranſlate this both in Engliſhe and Latine: *Deſcendit ad mortuos*, He deſcended among the Dead.

Obiection. Why, in effect this is nothing els but *to Dye*: and that was expreſſed of Chriſt before, *he was Dead, Buryed, &c.* But in this ſhort ſumme of Religion to repeate one point twiſe were needles, and againſt the nature of a ſhorte ſumme. And to vſe a darke and hard phraſe after a plaine and eaſie, is vnreaſonable & abſurd. It is true,

Anſwere. I hold it vnreaſonable altogeather in the ſhort and vulgar Creede appointed euen for the common Chriſtians, to vſe words darke and difficulte. And when the ſame thing is by diuers wordes expreſſed, the later ought to bee the lighter and cleerer, for to open the meaning the better which in the former is not ſo euident. Therefore I fully graunte in the Creede ſpeciallie, the phraſe muſt bee familiar, triuiall, eaſie, and plaine. Which heere in this taking of *Hades* is ſo: it is moſte eaſie (I ſaye) and * plaine to euery Grecian, and moſte naturall and proper in it ſelfe, as I haue ſufficiently ſhewed † before. For we muſt remember our Creed was not written in *Engliſhe*, and therefore our abuſiue worde *Hell* ought not to trouble vs. But looke wee to the Greeke *Hades* wherein it was written, and to the Hebrue *Sheol* wherevnto alſo the Greeke fitteth

* *Not if it bee taken for Hell, for ſo it is take but ſometime. It is very eaſie and familiar if wee take it generally for the world of the Dead.*

† *By many good authors. pag. 87. &c.*

ſitteth: and them it is as cleere as the Sonne at noone day, that *katabénai eis Haden* and *redeth Sheolah* are the common and familiar phraſes *to goe to the Worlde of the Dead*, or *among the Dead*. As for the repeating of theſame thing, it is not idle nor vnſignificant, but moſte *Emphaticall*. For euen preſentlie after the Apoſtles there aroſe Hæretikes * denyinge that Chriſt was a true Man but only in ſhew, and therefore alſo ſuffered and dyed but in shewe and appearance onely. Such alſo continued a long tyme, and ſuch are at this daye. Now to eſtabliſh all Chriſtians againſt ſuch diuelish opinions, the Primitiue Churche added heere diuers effectuall wordes, it ſeemeth. Whereas els it had bene enough to haue ſaide, *Hee ſuffered Vnder Pontius Pilate*: But to expreſſe and the ſignifie this pointe of Chriſtian faith euen for the ſimple more fullie, there is added further, firſte *Hee was Crucified*: and yet further, *Hee was Dead*; yea more, *He was Buryed*; and finally to ſpeake to the full, *Hee went to the Worlde of the Dead*, or *among the Dead*. And this laſte verelie is meant of the *Soule* of Chriſt, to ſhewe what it did, being nowe parted from the body: as the other wordes before are touching the viſible parte his *Bodye*, *Crucified*, *Dead*, *and Buryed*. Which *Bucer* ſawe verie well, * *Ex eo quod confitemur Dominum deſcendiſſe ad inferna intelligendum eſt, Dominum Spiritu*

The Hebrue and Greeke phraſes heerein all one. Redeth Sheolah: Katabénaj eis Haden.

* *Ignat. ad Trall.*

Note

* *Buc. in Matth. 27. 50.*

vitâ ſuo ità ſe iunxiſſe ſpiritibus mortuorum ſanctorum, vt corpore iunctus fuit illorum corporibus per ſepulturam. In that we beleeue that the Lorde went vnto the Dead, we vnderſtande that in his Soule he ioyned to the ſocietie of the Soules of the dead Saintes, euē as in his body he was ioyned to their bodyes by Buriall. So that all theſe wordes in the Creed haue a very profitable vſe and ſtronge *Emphaſis* for to ſhewe that Chriſt truely *Dyed* in deed, and had euery way the verie ſame condition as other mē had as touching Humane nature, that ſo all Chriſtians might bee the better eſtabliſhed againſt thoſe Hæreſies denying the ſame, as is aforeſaid. If any ſay, but in this ſhort ſumme there ſhould be no repetitions at all. I haue shewed, that this *his going among the Dead*, or *vnto the dead*, or *into the Vnſeene World*, is moſt fitlie to bee referred to the *Soule* of Chriſt parting from his body, shewing whither it went, euen whither all other Good mens Soules went, *to the place appointed for the Saintes:* thither went Chriſtes ſoule too, like other mens, being parted from his body: *eis Hadou.* Whereof if any doe aske particularlie, Whither is this? I aunſwere, namelie into †*heauē:* For whither ſhould the Saintes goe els? And thus it is *no repetition* of anie thing that particularlie went before. Howbeit in the Creed there are in deede *repetitions*, as short a ſumme as it is, and yet not vnprofitable. As thus, hauing ſaide, *He ſuffered*, it is added, *Crucified*, and after that *Dead*, yea *Buryed* is but an addi-

† Which is the true Grammaticall ſenſe of this word, viz. with reſpect had to the qualitie of Chriſtes perſon.

tion

tion alſo to ſignifie that he was *truely dead*. Therefore it is poſſible that there might be *repetitions* profitable in the Creede, and namely when they be ſpecially emphaticall. But further you will ſay, this word *He deſcended to the Dead*, doeth ſhewe, it ſeemeth, that the place was *downeward*, whither he went, and not *vpwarde* to Heauen. I aunſwere, That is nothing: So Iacob * ſpake *Ered el beni abel Sheolah*: I ſhall goe downe mourning to my Sonne among the Dead. Yet Iacob thought not to goe to *Hell* to his Sonne, but among the ſoules of the godly dead, that is to ſay *into Heauen*, where he knewe he ſhould be after death, & his Sonne he doubted not (being dead as he thought) was †there alreadie. So then this worde *Deſcending* or *Going downe*, is nothing els in this matter, but a "*decaying, a falling downe*, or *a cõming to an ende in this life*: becauſe they that liue and flouriſh heere, are ſaid to *ariſe*, and *ſtande vp*, and *ſpring vp*. Only this further emphaſis ſeemeth to be in it: *katebeni* may import that He came vnder the power and dominiõ, as it were, of Death, although but for a while: for he † could not be held thereof. Which is it, I thinke, that * *Olenian* vnderſtandeth in this place. Wherefore this phraſe in the Creede, agreeth with ỹ Hebrue very fitly, whẽce it ſeemeth alſo to be takẽ. And thus mẽ may ſee, it is euery way a moſt eaſie, a familiar, and vſuall phraſe, not with the Greeks

Obiection.

Anſwere.

* Gen. 37. 35.

† *It ſeemeth that the Grake properly can be heere meant: ſeeing Iacob hoped not to be together with his Sonne as touching the bodye.*

" *Bulling. Dec. 1. 7.*

† *Act. 2. 24.*

* *Olenian in Symbol.*

only, but in proportō with the Hebrue alſo, I ſay euen that in the Creede *katabeis Hadou* to ſignifie *Hee went vnto the Dead*, which we in Engliſh too corruptly vſe to ſay, *He went into Hell*: when as indeed heere concerning Chriſt, it was into Heauen.

Obiection. Laſtly it may be you will ſay, if Chriſts Soule after his death went immediatly into Heauen, then he Aſcended twiſe into Heauen: once before his reſurrection, and againe 40. dayes after it. In the Creede alſo then there are two articles touching this one matter of his *Aſcenſion*. But this ſeemeth very vntrue: ſpecially ſeeing himſelf ſaith after his riſing from death, † *I haue not yet aſcended*. Therefore immediatly after death hee went not *into Heauen*: and if not to Heauen, then to *Hell*.

† Ioh. 20. 17.

Anſwere. I anſwere, notwithſtanding all this, his ſoule might and did immediatly goe to *Heauen*. And what if in this wiſe he *Aſcended* twiſe? what reaſon is againſt it? That is, once in his Soule alone, in the time of his death, as the ſoules of all the Godly beſides doe: and once againe afterward when both Soule & Body togeather aſcended, euen as we alſo ſhall heereafter. Of this his later perfite intyre and apparant Aſcenſion, he ſaith, * *I haue not yet Aſcended*. Whereby he denyeth not his other maner of aſcending, that is in his ſoule only. Euen as " Peter *denyeth that David is yet aſcended*. Hee meaneth as touching his body

* Ioh. 20. 17.

" Act. 2. 34.

body and all: for his ſoule was then, and long before that (no doubt) aſcéded into *Heauen*. And thus in our Creed there may well be 2. articles, for 2. ſo diuers and diſtinct kindes of Chriſts going to *Heauen*.

Hitherto we haue waded in our firſte point, about the opening of the word of this Article of the Creede, *he deſcended to Hades*. Wherein it is as cleere as the light at noone, that the natural, ſimple, proper, and true meaning therof may be, *He went into the Dead*. Now followeth our †ſecond generall point, to proue that this is the very meaning therof, and nothing els indeede. Which thus I conclude. † See pag. 92.

If this Article meane not that Chriſt went to Limbus, nor went into the Graue, nor his Helliſo ſuffetinges on the Croſſe, nor afterward locally in Hell, nor any going down locally into Hell at all: thewheere is certainly meant that his ſoule ſeparat frō his body did go, as other mens do, into the World of the Dead, or among the dead, and nothing els.

But all thoſe former opinions are vntrue heere, and not meant in the Creede.

Therefore this our laſt rehearſed is true, & is there in the Creed truly & plainly intended, & meant.

1. Chriſt went not to any *Limbus* ſeing ẏ faithful before Chriſts time, had theſame benifit of grace in effect which wee ſince haue had. Becauſe Chriſt was theſame yeſterday, & theſame to day, & theſame for euer: and Faith, ẇ they had as well as we, was the euidence of things not ſeene, and

I. *No Limbus ſignifyed in our Creede.*

the ground of things hoped for: and Abraham ſaw the day of Chriſt, and reioyced: and the Fathers before did eate the ſame ſpirituall meate, & dranke the ſame ſpirituall drink which we doe: and Chriſt was the Sacrifice of redemption ſlaine before the beginning of the world. Therfore by the vertue and efficacie of Chriſtes death, Heauen was opened to them before his Incarnation, as well as vnto vs ſince. And therefore there was no *Limbus*, neyther could Chriſt goe to anie ſuch place. 2. This Article can not be meant of the *Graue*, becauſe that was moſt plainlie and familiarlie noted before in theſe wordes, *He was buried*: which to repeate againe in a darker & more doubtfull word as *Hades* is, without difference added, can not be likely. For *Hades*, as I ſaid, is referred generallie to *the ſtate of the Dead*: that is, to the *Soules* as well as to the *Bodyes* of the dead. 3. Heere are not meant Chriſtes *Helliſh ſorrowes* and ſufferings, which in deed he *on the Croſſe* indured, as wee haue ſhewed in the former quæſtiõ. Although *Maiſter Calum* thus thought, yet ſurely this Article ſeemeth to meane another thing: * (*quod pace tanti Viri dixerim*) becauſe 1. the word *Hades* ſignifieth not *Hel* peculiarly, as I haue ſhewed, but whẽ ſ place doth neceſſarily* require it. 2. If it were ſo, it muſt be here by a *Figure* not altogither ſo familiar, namely a *Metaphoricall* ſpeech, which hard-

2. *The Graue properly not ment by going to Hades in ſ Creed.*

3. *Chriſtes Helliſh ſorrowes which he ſuffred, not meant by his going to Hades.*

**Sauing the reuerence of ſo worthy a man.*

**As this place in the Creede doeth not.*

hardly may be admitted into this vulgar and familiar *Creed*. And generally it vvas meant and compriſed in thoſe former vvordes, *He ſuffered vnder Pontius Pilat*. Laſtlie, it ought not then to followe after ſo manie Articles put in betweene, as *Crucified, Dead, Buryed*. 4. This Article meaneth not anie ſufferings of Chriſt locally in *Hell* after his death on the Croſſe, as *Illiricus* thought: becauſe ſ Scripture ſaith, *by the bloud of his Croſſe* hee reconciled all things in heauen and in earth, and *through death* he deſtroyed him that had the power of death, and *on his Croſſe* he razed out all things that were againſt vs, and ſpoyled Principalities and powers, and triumphed openlie ouer them, and *on the Croſſe* he cryed, *It is finiſhed*. All this ſheweth that *on the Croſſe* was the laſt act and finall accompliſhment of all his *ſufferinges*. Therefore he ſuffred nothing *after* his death.

4. *Chriſtes going to Hades in the Creede, ſignifieth not any ſuffring locally in Hell after his death.*

The laſt errour that heere I am to confute, is this, (which nowe chiefflie I bende againſt) that which chiefflie troubleth the Churches in England at this day, by reaſon that ſome men, I knowe not whom, haue thought ſo. It is this, *That Chriſt after his death went downe into Hell*, not to ſuffer, but he went to triumph, or to inſult ouer the damned reprobat, or what to doe, it is not well knowen, nor yet determined. Nowe we affirme, this alſo is a meere fiction, and as falſe as the reſt. And that by

5. *Laſtly, Chriſt went not locallie into the vevie Hell of the damned at anie time, nor vpon anie occaſion.*

diuers reasons.

A generall argumit y Christ went not into Hell.

First, *If no Scripture proue it, then God forbid we should put this opinion among the Articles of our faith. But no Scripture proueth it: Therefore it ought in no wise to be beleeued of vs.*

Allegations against vs.

They alleadge for the *Denyall of the Assumption* chieflie foure textes of Scripture. But none to any purpose at all, as easilie we may see. First, * *Thou wilt not leaue my Soule in Hell,* (saye they) but falslie and iuriouslie to the text, as * before we haue declared. Our common translation hath, Thou wilt not leaue my Soule in the *Graue:* which is not much amisse, considering the scope of the Apostle there, and the manner of Scripture-phrase sometime. But the most playne, the most naturall, and familiar translation should be this (as also † I haue plainly noted before) *Thou wilt not leaue my Soule among the Dead, nor thy Holy one to see corruption.* This is certaine, it can not bee meant of *Hell,* as also I haue proued " before sufficientlie. Thus therefore their firste and chiefest place doeth saye nothingat all for them.

1.
* Actes 2. 27. and Psal. 16. 10.
* Pag. 113.
† Pag. 126.
" Pag. 114.

2.

Their second is: * Christ suffering for vs was *thanatotheis men sarki zoopoietheis de Pneumati, en hō kai tois en phylake pneumasi poreutheis ekeryxen Apeitheſasi pote, hote hapax exedecheto he tou Theou makrothumia en hemerais Noe:* Don to Death in the Flesh, but made alive by the Spirit, wherein hee went (or, had gone) and

* 1. Pet. 3. 18, 19, 20.

prea-

preached to the ſpirites in priſon Hauing bene (or, whiche were) diſobedient in tyme, paſt when once the longe ſuffering of God did wayte in the dayes of Noe. This place is as playne as may be cleane to an other purpoſe: that is *Chriſt in his Paſſion dyed as touching his Manhood, but was rayſed to life again by his Diuine Spirit, in which in the dayes of Noe he went and preached to thoſe who were nowe (in Peters tyme) damned ſoules in Hell, and had bene in tyme paſt (in Noes tyme) diſobedient, when as the long ſuffering of GOD wayted for their repentance but all in vayne.* Thus heere is no one word of his *Soules going after death to the ſoules in Hell,* and of his *then preaching* to them: as ſome would frō hence willinglie gather. First I will proue our former tranſlatiō & ſenſe to be true: then, I will confute ſuch of their chiefeſt reaſons as they vſe to make frō this place for them ſelues. And firſt, If *to Pneumati* by ỹ Spirit be here the *Diuine Spirit, the Godhead* of Chriſt and not his *Humane Soule*, thē our tranſlation & ſenſe is true, & theirs falſe. But here *to Pneumati* ſignifieth *by the Diuine Spirit*, that is *by the Godhead* of Chriſt, and not *by his Humane Soule*. Therfore our tranſlation & ſenſe is true, & theirs is falſe. The *aſſumptiō* only is here doubted of. But it hath many moſt certain proofs. Firſt, it is moſt familiar & cōmon in Scripture by *Fleſh* to vnderſtand ỹ *whole* †*Humane nature*, & by *Spirit* the* *Diuine nature*. But where both are mētioned togither oppoſitely, there they always & euermore

The true ſenſe of Peter in this place.

Reaſons for iuſtifying our interpretation of Peter in this place.

† 1. Ioh. 4. 2. Ioh. 1. 14. Heb. 5. 7. & 2. 14. & 1. Pet. 4. 1.

* Reu. 2. 7. & 6. Acts 16. 7.

more signifie so in *Christ, and in † other men *Flesh* alwayes signifieth the *corrupt nature wholy*, the *Spirit*, *all the regenerate parte* in them. I say, these wordes *Flesh* and *Spirit* mentioned thus togeather oppositely, do neuer in Scripture signifie the *Body* and *Soule* of a man. Therefore in this place also agreeably to the perpetuall vse of the Scripture besides, these wordes *Flesh* and *Spirit* ought to signifie the *Humane* and the *Diuine* natures of Christ, not the 2. partes of his Humanitie, his *Soule* and his *Body*: specially seeing no Circumstance heere ouerthroweth this sense, as both before, and likewise presentlie after we shall further see. Againe, the very same thing is spoken by ‖ *Paul*, but more expreslie: *Hee was crucified touching his infirmitie, but liueth by the power of God.* A place most excellent to be cõpared with this heere in *Peter*. That which *Peter* calleth *Flesh*, *Paul* calleth *infirmitie*, and that whiche *Peter* called *Spirit*, *Paule* calleth *the power of God*. That is, the one signifieth his *whole Humanitie*, both bodye and Soule, the other his verie *Deitie*. And so by comparing these two most like textes, our sense is cleerly iustified. Thirdlie, if *Spirit* heere signifie his humane *Soule*, then of necessitie you must say, Hee was made aliue *in* his Soule, or *by* his Soule: *zóopoietheis tō pneúmati*. But both these are wicked and false to say: First, not *in* his Soule, for then his soule was once dead or mor-

* Rom. 1. 3, 4.
1 Tim. 3. 16.
† Gal. 5. 17.
Rom. 8. 5.
‖ 2. Cor. 13. 4

tall at leaſt, becauſe the word is *zóopoiethei*, He was made aliue *in* his Soule, beeing don to death *in* his body. 2. Neither can it be *by* his Soule, for then he liued againe *by the power of his Soule*, and not of God, whiche is abſurd and contrarie to many Scriptures before noted. Therefore *Spirit* here muſt needes be the *Godhead* & Diuine power of Chriſt, *by the which* he was in deede made aliue after his death in his *Manhood*. 4. If theſe wordes *Fleſh* and *Spirit* doe ſignifie heere in Chriſt his *Body* and *Soule*, then they can not beare any ſenſe but ſuch as agreeth with all other men when they dye: to be dead in their bodies, but to liue in their ſoules. But this text in theſe wordes ſheweth ſurelye ſome ſingular thing happening to Chriſt, wherein hee differed from other men: as who ſo veweth the place, may eaſilie ſee. Therefore theſe words here do not ſignifie in Chriſt his body and ſoule, but his *Manhoode* and *Godhead*. 5. All *preaching* is to amende the hearers, or to take away from them all excuſe. This is the very nature and perpetuall vſe of *Preaching*. But thus hee coulde not *preach to the Spirites in Hell*. On the earth he could *by his eternal Spirit* in the mouth of Noe to thoſe liuing then in thoſe dayes, though careles and diſobedient. Therefore this *preaching* is heere meant to haue bene on earth in thoſe former tymes, and not then in *Hel*. And ſo cóſequently in his

Diuine

That Christ should be sayde being dead, to goe and preach horrour and cõfusion to the Damned of Noes time now in Hell, not mentioning any other of them beside, is absurd & vaine.

Diuine Spirit, & not in his *Humane Soule*. 6. If it be absurd to saye, He preached to the damned in *Hell* who liued in Noes time, more then to the other damned: and if there be good reason to saye this of his preaching on earth in Noahs time, then this is meant of his Diuine Spirite preaching then in the mouth of Noe, and not of his humane soule preaching after his death in *Hell*. But it is absurd to say, Hee preached in *Hell* to those of Noes tyme, more thẽ to the other damned there. And if you aske what reason there is to mention his preaching on earth to them of Noes time more then to all other disobedient before & since. I answer, it meaneth not but ỳ Christ preached by his diuine spirit to all the rest likewise, euẽ frõ *Adam* to *Iohn Baptist*: but this speciall instance is fitly named, as being one of the most singular tymes of conuicting the prophane rebellious worlde. Nowe this reason can not be yeelded for his preaching to thẽ in *Hell* which were of *Noes* time, more thẽ to the rest: as all men of any reason doe see. Therfore this place is meant of Christes *Diuine Spirit*, not of his *Humane Soule*.

Now cõtrariewise for their reasons that this is meant of Christs *Soule preaching in Hel*, the most & the best that I finde are in Mr *Hill*, noted & confuted by Mr *Humes* verie effectually. I wil now touch but 2. of thẽ: becausse if I should deale further, I might

Phil. 2. 7, 8, 9.

seeme

ſeeme to do ỳ which he hath don already.

Firſt thus they ſay, No *Paſsiue* can agree to the *Deitie*. But *made to liue* is heere a *Paſſiue*. Therfore it can not be that the *Deitie* is here the *Spirit*, in which he is ſaid to be made aliue. We ſaye not, He was made aliue *in* ỳ ſpirit, but *by* the ſpirit, & ſo ought it to be tranſlated. Therfore this *Paſsiue* is attributed to the Deitie, but is the effect not of Chriſtes Deitie in his Manhood. Obiection. Anſwer.

An other obiection is, that *pote* in time paſt doth diſtinguiſhe *apeistheſaſi* to the diſobedient with which it goeth, frõ *poreuetheis ekéryxen* he had gon and preached. Which is moſt vntrue: for though *pote* follow *apeistheſaſi*, yet it is ſo euident and vndenyable that this Aduerbe *pote* may haue reference (and by all reaſon it muſt) to this whole clauſe *poreuetheis ekéryxen apeistheſaſi pote*, and ſo diſtinguiſheth all this frõ all ỳ clauſe next before *tois en phylake pneumaſi* (where vnderſtand *ouſi*) and that is, *to the Spirits that are in priſon*. And ſo *pote* plainly diſtinguiſheth *apeistheſaſi* frõ *tois en phylake* (*ouſi*) but not frõ *ekéryxen*. As Mr. *Beza* heereon doth well declare. Obiection. Anſwer.

The other reaſons, though 9. or 10. in number, are not worth the naming: yet whatſoeuer force is in them, Mr. *Hunnes* hath ſo defeated it, that I will ſurſeaſe to ſpeake any more thereof. But thus it remayneth that this place of Peter is nothing at all for them, who moſte erroneouſly thinke that *Chriſt in his Soule went downe after death, and preached in Hell.*

† Ephe. 4. 9. Nowe the third Scripture is, † *Christ in that he aſcended, what is it but that hee deſcended firſt into the loweſt partes of the earth?* Heere firſt note the true meaning, and then the miſtaking of this place. I ſay then theſe words are a reaſon take frō Chriſts *Aſcending* into Heauen to proue his *Deſcending* from Heauen ffrſt. As if he ſhould ſay, in aſmuch as wee ſee Chriſt our Lordes Aſcending vp into Heauē, it followeth that he the very ſame Lord Deſcended thence firſte: that wee may learne by him howe *humiliation* goeth before *glory*, and *ſubmiſſion* before *exaltation*. Nowe this beeing all, as indeed it is in this place, there is no need to take this *Deſcending* of any locall going downe into Hell. But you will ſay, whether doe the words cloſe following *eis ta katóter a mere tês gês*, to the lower partes of the earth, adde any thinge in the ſenſe further, or no? And if they doe adde more in the ſenſe, how far do they ſignifie? I anſwer, I ſee not but they may be taken moſt fitlie to *adde* ſomething in the ſenſe of that ſentence before of his Deſcending, and yet nothing for his going to *Hell*. Euen this (as I take it) to ſhewe more particularly howe baſe a Deſcending and comming into the world Chriſt had, in humbling himſelfe euen to the *Graue*. And ſo it may bee very like that other place of this Apoſtle: *He made himſelfe of no reputation, and tooke on him the forme of a ſeruant and was made*

Phil. 2. 7, 8, 9.

made like vnto men, and was found in shape as a man. He humbled himselfe and became obedient vnto death, euen the death of the Crosse. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, &c. Thus I say in both these places this degree of the *basenesse* of Christs humiliation is notablie expressed: heere in the Philip. in that hee *humbled himselfe vnto death*, and before in the Ephes. in that *hee descended euen to the Graue*, that is to say also vnto *Death*.

But some will say, the *Graue* is not *in* the *lower partes of the Earth*, but alwayes a little vnder the earth, that is in ỹ higher part of it. Rather *Hell* may be thought to be in the *midst* of ỹ earth. I answere: *Ta katotera mere tẽs gẽs* the lower partes of the earth, seems to me a very plaine *Hebraisme*, expressing *Tachtijoth erets*: which wordes are no where found for *Hell*, for the *Graue* they are found: also where in a similitude the *Graue* (not with *Hell*) a "womans wombe is called *tachtijoth erets*. Like to this also is * *erets tachtijth* the Earth beneath. Now albeit Maister *Hill* auoucheth eagerlie that these places are for *Hell*, yet the very seuerall circumstances in them doe plainly teach that the *Graue* only is there meant, and *the condition of Death*: as † Mr. *Humes* doeth plainly declare against him. If a man aske, how the *Graue* may be called *the lower part of the earth* I answer, it may very well, and is in comparision of this Earth where wee liue, which is the " *higher parts* of the earth: the oppo-

Obiection.

Answere.

* As Mat. 12. 40.

† Psal. 63. 9.

" Psal. 139. 15
* Ezech. 31. 14 16, 18.

† Sect. 9.

" *Whence the liuing are called* Superstites *and sometime* Superi: *the Dead sometime* Inferi.

oppositiō thus stāding betwene ỹ Liuing & the Dead & betwene their *proper habitations*, not betweene the *Liuing* & *Hell*. The same sēse manifestly hath another *Hebru* phrase very like to this: * *Sheol tachtijah* or *tachah*, where thogh many think *Hel* is signified, yet surely ỹ circumstances do conuince that the Graue only is there meant, the *Graue beneath*: as Mr. *Fulke* against *Gr. Martin* doth cleerlie proue. Which also we shall further declare & make manifest by ỹ phrase ‖ *in the heart of the earth*, as we shall see presently in the answere to the next Scripture obiected afterward. But if any yet say touching †this, ỹ heere is opposed Christs *lowest* debasing to his *highest* ascending. Now *Hell* is the lowest debasing of Christ, not ỹ *Graue*. Therfore *Hell* is heere vnderstoode, & not the *Graue*. Surely thus by this reason it must follow ỹ Christ not only was in *Hell*, but ỹ he *suffered also in Hell*. For indeed it was a far greater humiliatiō of Christ *to suffer* the paines of Hel (which we haue proued before that he might & *did suffer indeed) thē to be locally *in Hell* with triumph without suffering. But it is most false & injurious to Christes death to say, *he suffered in the lower parts of the Earth*, taking the same for *Hell*. Therfore his debasemēt here we take in the estimatiō of the world, ỹ is so far as they might sensibly coceiue of his miserable & base cōdition. Now that could be no lower thē the *Graue*. As for *Hel*, both his going thither, & his suffering of it, whether in ỹ very place,

* Psal. 86. 13. Isa. 14. 10.

‖ Mat. 12. 40

† Eph. 4. 9, 10

* *Not after his death, but before his death.*

or out of the place, all this was insensible to the world, & not cõming within their estimation: & so not heere spoken of nor intended, where only the *apparant baſenes* of Christ is compared with the *apparant going vp* of Christ aboue the sensible Heauens. Thus do I iudge that the descẽding of Christ *to the lower parts of the earth* may be taken truly, plainly, and as is agreeable to the Hebrue phrase whence surely this Greek phrase ariseth, namely for Christs humiliation euen vnto the *Graue*, that is to becom *vnder the power of Death*. Howbeit some do thinke, it may be takẽ as directlie alluding to that † *metaphoricall* Hebrue phrase *tachtiyoth erets*, the lower partes of the earth, where *Dauid* meaneth his *mothers wombe*, where he tooke flesh & so came into this worlde of men. And then likewise *Paul* * here meaneth only Christes taking our flesh, & his cõming into this our world, in that he saith *hee descended to the lower partes of the earth*. So also § sense of these scrip. may be fitly cõpared withit. † *No man ascendeth vp to Heauen but he that descended from Heauen, the Sonne of man which is in Heauen.* And * *I came out from the Father and came into the world: againe I leaue the world, and go to the Father.* Euen so these wordes, *He descended to the lower partes of the Earth*, with opposition to his *Ascending into Heauẽ*, in this sense may signifie generally his abasement, in taking flesh in his mothers wombe, and so his comming into this our world, before hee was exalted in his Ascension. Lastly, others doe thinke, that this Greeke

† Psal. 139. 15

* In Ephe. 4.

† Ioh. 3. 13.

* Ioh. 16. 28.

oppositiō thus stāding betwene ỹ Liuing & the Dead & betwene their *proper habitations*, not betweene the *Liuing* & *Hell*. The same sēse manifestly hath another Hebru phrase very like to this: * *Sheol tachtijah* or *tachah*, where thogh many think *Hel* is signified, yet surely ỹ circumstances do conuince that the Graue only is there meant, the *Graue beneath*: as Mr. *Fulke* against *Gr. Martin* doth cleerlie proue. Which also we shall further declare & make manifest by ỹ phrase ‖ *in the heart of the earth*, as we shall see presently in the answere to the next Scripture obiected afterward. But if any yet say touching ‡this, ỹ heere is opposed Christs *lowest* debasing to his *highest* ascending. Now *Hell* is the lowest debasing of Christ, not ỹ *Graue*. Therfore *Hell* is heere vnderstoode, & not the *Graue*. Surely thus by this reason it must follow ỹ Christ not only was in *Hell*, but ỹ he *suffered also in Hell*. For indeed it was a far greater humiliatiō of Christ *to suffer* the paines of Hel (which we haue proued before that he might & *did suffer indeed) thē to be locally *in Hell* with triumph without suffering. But it is most false & injurious to Christes death to say, *he suffered in the lower parts of the Earth*, taking the same for *Hell*. Therfore his debasemēt here we take in the estimatiō of the world, ỹ is so far as they might sensibly cōceiue of his miserable & base cōdition. Now that could be no lower thē the *Graue*. As for *Hel*, both his going thither, & his suffering of it, whether in ỹ very place,

* Psal. 86. 13. Isa. 14. 10.

‖ Mat. 12. 40

‡ Eph. 4. 9, 10

* *Not after his death, but before his death.*

or out of the place, all this was insensible to the world, & not cõming within their estimation: & so not heere spoken of nor intended, where only the *apparant baseness* of Christ is compared with the *apparant going vp* of Christ aboue the sensible Heauens. Thus do I iudge that the descẽding of Christ *to the lower parts of the earth* may be taken truly, plainly, and as is agreeable to the Hebrue phrase whence surely this Greek phrase ariseth, namely for Christs humiliation euen vnto the *Graue*, that is to becom *vnder the power of Death*. Howbeit some do thinke, it may be takẽ as directlie alluding to that † *metaphoricall* Hebrue phrase *tachtioth erets*, the lower partes of the earth, where *Dauid* meaneth his *mothers wombe*, where he tooke flesh & so came into this worlde of men. And then likewise *Paul* * here meaneth only Christes taking our flesh, & his cõming into this our world, in that he saith *hee descended to the lower partes of the earth*. So also ỹ sense of these scrip may be fitly cõpared withit. † *No man ascendeth vp to Heauen but he that descended from Heauen, the Sonne of man which is in Heauen.* And * *I came out from the Father and came into the world: againe I leaue the world, and go to the Father.* Euen so these wordes, *He descended to the lower partes of the Earth*, with opposition to his *Ascending into Heauẽ*, in this sense may signifie generally his abasement, in taking flesh in his mothers wombe, and so his comming into this our world, before hee was exalted in his Ascension. Lastly, others doe thinke, that this Greeke

† Psal. 139. 15

* In Ephe. 4.

† Ioh. 3. 13.

* Ioh. 16. 28.

phraſe *eis katotera mere tes ges*, to the lower parts of the earth, is no Hebraiſme, but onely a figure of ſpeach in the Greeke, a kinde of *Hypallage: the lower partes of the earth*, for *the Earth which is the lower partes of the world*. And ſo both theſe later ſenſes do *adde* nothing in ſignification touching Chriſtes *Deſcending* or his comming from Heauen into this world: but they meane onlie and generally, He *firſt* deſcended *before* he aſcended. And this laſt ſenſe *amplifyeth* it (as it were) by a kinde of deſcription, ſhewing what this world, or this earth is where we liue, and whither Chriſt deſcended; euen the lower partes of the world in compariſon of the Heauens whence he deſcended, and whither afterwarde from the earth he went vp againe.

Hypallage.

Either of theſe two later ſenſes might heere very well ſerue: but I iudge rather the firſt to be likelieſt. Howſoeuer it bee, to dreame heere of *Hel* there is no reaſon. And this wee ſhall make further to appeare by confuting the next and laſt obiection of Mat. 12.40.

In * this place therefore Chriſt is ſaide to haue bene *three dayes and three nights in the heart of the Earth*. What is that, but in the middeſt of the earth? And how was Chriſt there, vnles he were there in *Hell?* I aunſwere, this alſo is a manifeſt *Hebraiſme*, like to † that: *Tyrus was very glorious in the heart of the Seas: beleb iammim*. Tyrus was not in the deepe

* Mat. 12.40.

† Ezech. 27. 25, 26.

thepe of the ſea, nor in the *middeſt* of the ſea, for it ſtood cloſe by the continent land, as Geography teacheth vs: but the Prophets meaning by that phraſe is, that Tyrus was * *compaſſed about with the Sea*, though ſtanding neere to the Sea ſhore. Euen ſo Chriſt in his *Graue* may well bee ſaid to bee *in the heart of the earth* after that phraſe: that is *compaſſed about with the earth* though far from the middeſt of the earth, euen a little beneath the vpmoſt parte of theſame, as *Graues* are wont to bee made. Further this cannot poſſibly be meant of Chriſtes *Soule going into Hell*, becauſe the Iewes heere asked Chriſt for a *viſible ſigne*, & he ſaid he would giue them *a ſigne*: that is to ſay a viſible miracle. Now this miracle was, how Chriſt ſhould be 3. dayes & 3. nights buryed in the earth, and then riſe againe to life: like Ionahs comming againe into the world after hee had bene 3. dayes and 3. nights in the Fiſhes belly. In this only hee would condeſcend vnto them, and giue them only this viſible ſigne, like as they craued, but not any more. Therefore this cannot bee any going to *Hell* and comming thence againe: for that had ben vtterly no *viſible ſigne*, neither had he anſwered any whit to their deſire at al, as the text ſaith he did, namely to giue them this *one ſigne* only ſo as they deſired, and as might bee cõparable in their ſenſe to that of Ionah. Againe if heere *the heart*

* *or in a manner compaſſed.*

of the earth be *Hell*, then was Christ all the time of his death in *Hell* euen till the moment of his resurrection, which thing the chiefe defendors of this dreame dare not auouch: and that of * *Luke* refuteth it, *This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*: as anon God willing, we shall further see. Therefore the *heart of the earth* † theere must not in any wise be take for *Hell*. Which also that speech of Christ nowe a dying, *Father into thy handes I commend my Spirit*, doth euidentlie proue. Where Christ sheweth (according to the vsuall phrase of men in such a case) that hee hoped presently to goe to Heauen. No man thinketh to go to Hell, whē he saith, *Lord into thy handes I cōmend my Soule:* no more therfore now did Christ, as is further shewed " afterward. Lastly, both against this and * that last before, thus I reason: If these Textes speake of *Hell*, then certainlie *Hell* is in the lowest partes of the earth, in the middest of the earth. But it could neuer bee affirmed directlie and precislie that *Hell* is in the *middest* or deepest of the earth. Nay it is most false: For the Diuells are † holden in Hell. But the Diuells are locallie " *on the earth*, and *in the ayre*. Therefore *Hell* is not precislie in the *middest* of the Earth. Some will say, *Hell* is *beneath*, as the † Scripture teacheth. I aunswere, if you translate that so, yet it sayeth not *Hell beneath vs*, but *Hell beneath*. That is in comparison of *Heauen*, whiche.

* Luke 23.43.

† Mat. 12. 40.

" Pag. 151.

* Ephe. 4. 9.

† 1. Pet. 3. 4.

" Math. 8. 28

Ephe. 2. 2.

Obiection.

† Prou. 15. 24

Answere.

is on *Highe*: so Hell maye bee *downewarde* from Heauen, but hee ſayeth not in reſpect of vs here on earth. Secondly, They who take this for the *Graue*, and the Bodilie deſtruction (as the worde in deede verie often, and familiarlie doeth alſo ſignifie) doe eaſilie auoyde this Obiection. Thirdlie, it is not the vnlikelieſt to hold, that *Sheol* heere ſignifying the *ſtate of death* or *deſtruction in this world*, *Mattah*, *declining* or *downeward*: Conſidering alſo and comparing the former parte of this verſe with this later, & the next following likewiſe: It ſeemeth *the wiſe man* ſayeth: The way of life to the wiſe tendeth after thinges *on high*, whereby hee eſcapeth *deſtruction*, the way whereof is *groueling* on the earth, and ſeeketh not the thinges that are aboue, which bring *life*, but the thinges that are *beneath*, which are ſnares of death. And thus heere may be ſome affinitie with the Exhortation * to ſeeke the thinges *aboue*, and not the things that be earthly *beneath*. But heere is no locall aſſignation for *Hell*.

* Col. 3. 1, 2.

Obiection.

You will ſaye, Where then is *Hell*, is there no certaine locall place of tormentes to the reprobates nowe? We doubt not but the wicked and the Diuels † are now *locally* tormented in ſom certain place, & ſhalbe after this world ended: but where this is the Scripture teacheth not, neither ought we to inquire after it, but to learne howe by all meanes to auoyde it.

Anſwer.

† Luke 16. 23.

Nothing in all the Scripture for Christes going to Hell: therefore it is a fable.

Thus farre the Scriptures haue bene examined, and nothing in them is found to proue *Christs Soules going to Hell*. Wich about all things ought to be; I saye somewhat ought to be in Scripture for it, if we will haue such an Article of our faith. And I demaund, are not they *Haretikes* that will needes holde an Article of Faith meerely without Scripture, as well as they that will not receaue something expressed in Scripture? Well: to beleeue therefore anie article of our faith, it is requisit that we haue the Scriptures warrant. Yea further, It ought not onely to be in the Scripture, but it ought to be very plaine, expresse, and most easie to be proued out of Scripture: or els in no wise to make it a maine Article of our common Faith. But all men know, and our Aduersaries herein confesse, it is a hard, a doubtfull, and a very intricat point, and with much difficultie to be proued in scripture, that Christes Soule went downe into *Hell*. Therefore them selues graunt in effect that this doctrine ought not to be any part of our common *Creede*.

The Scriptures are cleerely against Christes going into Hel.

Nay further I vrge, if wee consider the Scriptures vnpartiallie, we do find diuers singular places in them against this doctrine, prouing his soule after his death was not in *Hell*. First, * *This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise*. This is spoken *of the Humanitie of Christ. But not of his Body which lay*

1.

*Luke. 23. 43.

in

in the Graue: Therefore of his Soule, that it went the same day presentlie into Paradise, and then not into Hell. If you denie that this is meant of his Humanitie, I proue it most plainlie. 1. This *Participle Metá*, is more pregnant then *Sun*, to signifie *a mutuall participation* of somewhat. So that if we note the emphasis of this phrase well, *met' emou ese* is as much as to say *This day I shall haue parte with thee, and thou with me of a blessed chaunge*, that is, from this miserable Crosse which now we both suffer, to Paradise, whither wee shall both goe hence presentlie. But this is true of his *Humane Soule*, not of his *Deitie*, to participate with the Theefe, and the Theefe with him both in sorrow & ioye. Therefore he meaneth heere his *Soule* shal be presently *to day in Paradise*. Againe, this speach is directlie and purposelie a Consolation to the Holy Theefe, certifying him that he should see quickly an alteration in the things that nowe he sorrowed for. But he sorrowed grieuously both for his owne miserie and for Christes most vnworthy torments, as may be seene † presentlie before ‡ he receaued this cõsolation. Therefore this Consolation sheweth him, that Christ should be translated also as wel as him selfe very quickly from the Crosse into glorie. Lastly, the good Theef saith to Christ as *Man* being yet in misery, but beleeuing he should shortlie bee in glorie, *Lord remember me when thou comest into*

† vers. 42.

thy kingdome. As if he ſhould ſay, Lord, I ſee well thy wofull miſerie nowe, but I know thou ſhalt hence goe into thy glorious kingdome: remember me therfore when thou comeſt thither. This is nowe altogeather of Chriſtes *Manhood*. Muſt not Chriſtes aunſwere bee iuſt to his ſenſe, Speciallie ſeeing he aunſwereth to Comfort him in his forenoted griefe? Yes verelie. He aunſwereth therefore to this effect. Be of good cheere, this day I ſhall in deed come into my kingdome, and thy ſelfe with me. That is *Me*, whom nowe thou grieueſt to ſee thus afflicted, & whó thou belieueſt to goe hence to a kingdome, euen *me*, though nowe in deede an afflicted *man*, yet to day thou ſhalt ſee in my kingdome in Paradiſe. And therefore this worde *sémeron to day* ſeemeth alſo to haue a cõtrarie reference to this his ſtate nowe, and this nowe, contrarie to that *to daye* inſuing quicklie afterwarde. As if he ſhould ſaye, *Nowe afflicted*, but *preſently anon in glorie*. All this muſt needes be of his *Humane Soule* verily without all quæſtion: There is none can conſider heerein his Deitie. If anie thinke his *Soule* might goe to *Hell* firſt, and yet preſentlie goe thence to *Heauẽ* yer night alſo. That is ridiculous and toyiſh: it needeth maruelous plaine ſcripture to deſcribe that, or els we ought to hold it as a ſingular fable. It was nowe within 2 or 3. houres of the dayes ende,

when

when Christ spake this: so that hee had neede to goe quicke, & come quicke, and tarie but a little there. Well this place thé I doubt not, is very plaine against Christs Soules descending into *Hell*.

Likewise **Father into thy handes I commend my Soule*. What if *Gods hand* sometime doth signifie his generall protection onely and gouernement? But consider the present circumstance here: Christ was now on the Crosse so pitifully oppressed with sorrowes, as that he seemed a forlorne man, & forsakē not of men onely, but of God to: yet he euen nowe being about to yeelde vp his life to death, lifting vp his harte to God in peace and great assurance, saieth, *Father into thy handes I commende my soule*. Tell me, doe men vse thus to saye when they thinke to goe to Hell, or doe they not hope presentlie to inioye Heauen? And what els did *Stephan*, *saying, *Lord, receaue my Spirit*. Men in such case when they speak thus, declare a certaine hope in thé that they shall speedilie be released from their sorrowes, and receaued into ioyes with God in Heauen. Thus is *Gods hande* taken heere agreeablie to this common phrase of men. As also the Scripture hath it †*In thy presence is fulnes of ioye, and at thy right hande are pleasures for euermore*. Wherefore Christ now hanging heere on the Crosse, and readie to dye, vnderstandeth Gods hande surelie in this manner.

2. * verse 46

* Act. 7. 59.

† Psal. 16. 11.

There is no man of ſenſe cõſidering thes circumſtances that can iudge otherwiſe.

Gods Handes. *Gods handes* therfore we ſay in this caſe ſignifieth the meanes wherby he taketh hys ſeruauntes to him ſelf, and holdeth them with him ſelfe as his owne poſſeſſions, cõming out of tribulation, wherein while they were, they ſeemed far of from God, and as it were out of his *hand* and poſſeſſion, & ſubiect to their enimies power: but nowe commending their Soules *into Gods hande*, they declare their deſire and hope to be rid from theſe ſeparations, and to be there where they deſire, that is receaued by *Gods hande* into his ioyfull preſence and heauenly poſſeſſion.

Obiection. But they will ſaye, Dauid from whom theſe wordes are taken, did not preſentlie after he ſpake thus, goe to Heauen. No more then may we think that Chriſt did.

Anſwere. If Dauid thẽ preſentlie went not to Heauen, What then? I hope he went not to Hell, neither thought he of Hell when he ſpake ſo. Howſoeuer it was, this I ſaye, if Dauid were nowe a giuing vp the ghoſt, as Chriſt was when he thus ſpake, doubtles then he meant thereby that preſentlie he hoped for Heauen. I graunt men ſomtime though not a dying, but beeing in grieuous anguiſhe and daungerous troubles whiche often tymes bringe euen death with them, then alſo they will commend their Soule into the hands of God.

And

And so might *Dauid* in this † place whence Christ taketh this sentence: and yet nevertheless he desired and hoped for present release, and insteed of his sorrowe, present inioying of the Lordes comfort and ioyfull fauour. Which in a measure and proportion is answereable to the attayning of Heauē, which they haue who depart hence. If any say, the Greeke word in the text *parathesomas* is *I will commend:* noting that he look't not for present and immediat entring into Heauen, but in time heerafter. That is a most vaine and ignorant cauillation, proceeding from not considering the *Hebraisme* there in. For Dauid in like maner hath *aphkid*, a worde *Future* in forme, but of the *present* time in sense, as is most frequent with the *Hebrues*, and as the very circumstances heere doe require it to be. † Psal. 30.

Third: In † Luke we see a generall and eternall Lawe set *esteriktai* betweene Hell and Heauen, *that none in Hell can come to Heauen, nor out of Heauen into Hell.* This *Law* I say is confirmed more surely then that of the *Medes & Persians which also might not be broken.* Therefore Christ brake it not, neither went he down into Hell at all. If any say, true it is, this a generall and eternall Law for all other Creatures, that they can neuer passe to and fro beeing once in Hell. But Christ being the Son of God heerin was priuileged aboue all other men, this

3. † Luke 16. 26. Dan. 6. Obiection.

was

Answere. was a thing peculiar to him. Is that a priuilege for Christ to goe into Hell, and to come thence againe? A worthy priuilege surely, and very honorable. All men woulde thinke it a greater honor neuer to haue come in Hell at all. But seeing it is so flatly contrarie to so *generall a Lawe*, it behoueth you to haue most cleere euidence and plaine proofe in the worde to affirme it, or els wee haue great cause to abhorre it and to holde it no prerogatiue, but a thing verie iniurious and derogatory to the Man whiche was also the Sonne of God. Now what euidence and proofe you haue for it which defend it, wee haue seene and tryed to bee more then vaine, if wee note them with any indifferency. Seeing therefore he which was *like vs in all thinges (sinne onely excepted)* hath left him selfe no witnesse of this most strange and wondrous difference in him, why should wee dreame of such *an extraordinary case* so presumptuously? Further I reason thus: *If he triumphed not in Hell, hee went not into Hell. But hee triumphed not in Hell. Therefore he went not into Hell at all.* The *Assumption* is proued: first, Seing *Triumph* is a word taken from the custom of men of warre, who hauing in battaile conquered their enemies doe vse to triumph ouer them. And this their *Triumph* men vse to make in the presense of such, as to whom the glory thereof doeth in parte appertaine.

Other reasons that Christe went not into Hell.

1.

taine. But in *Hell* there were none with Christ in whose presence he should *triumph*, and to whom some parte of his glorie might belong. There were none besides, but the Diuells and damned soules. Therfore it is *absurd* to say *Christe triumphed in Hell.* A againe, *where Christ actually & meerle triumphed there began his glorification. But is it not absurd*, yea of all absurdities the greatest *to say Hell was the beginninge of Christes glorification. Therefore certainly Christe did not triumph in Hell.* Some will say hee might aswell triumph in *Hell*, as on the *Crosse*. Howe could Christ triumphe on the *Crosse*, as we interpret that he did: † *He triumphed on the same Crosse.* Hee was there in sore torments, and in most pitious plight. Call ye that *a triumph*? I answere, wee neuer saide, nor the Apostle meante that Christ triumphed *actually* on the Crosse, but *vertually* as I may say. That is the vertue and efficacie of that death did not bring destruction to the sufferer but to the Doer and to the executioner, that is to the Diuell: with whom hee spirituallie combated there euen vntill death, and by death was not *vanquished*, but *did vanquish* him that had the power of death, that is the Diuell: and him selfe *triumphed*. Which *effect* is contrarie in all other battailles and conflictes. For with vs they who are slaine in fighte, are conquered, and the suruiuer triumpheth.

2.

Obiection.

† Col. 2. 15.

Answere.

How Christ is said to triumph on the Crosse.

But

But the Holy Ghost giueth vs to know the *contrarie* touching Christ and his sufferings. For his *suffering* was his *victorie*, & his *dying* his *triumph*. But he meaneth not *actually*: for while hee suffered, and while he dyed, this was a miserable triumph: and still he suffered, euen till he gaue vp the Ghost. Therefore the meaning heere is not of any *actuall* triumph: but onely *by vertue* of that which there he suffered, hee triumphed indeed, and the *Crosse* whereon he was lifted vp was like *a triumphing Chariot*. All this is thus named because the *effect* of those sufferinges simplie was the moste perfite treading vnder feet of Sathan and of all infernall powers. But nowe his *triumphing in Hell* can be nothing so. Either in Hell it was *actuall*, which is monstruous absurd: for then Hell was the entrance of his *Glorifying*, which all the worlde knoweth is the moste inglorious and vilest debasinge. Or at least his verie presense was *meritorious, and virtually triumphant*: and this is flatly blasphemous against the allsufficient merit of the *Crosse* of Christ.

Dilemma.

Heere some will aske, howe doth this derogate from the *Crosse* of Christe, if hee *triumphed* in Hell? Because *hee triumphed on his Crosse*, yea perfitlie: therefore hee did not in *Hell*. But it is doubted, yea denyed that Christ triúphed at all on the Crosse. Let the Scripture then speake;

Obiection.

Answere.

ho en hypenantion hemin what soeuer was any way against vs he tooke it out of the way, and fastened it to the Crosse, hauing spoyled Principalities and powers, made a shewe of them openly, and hath triumphed ouer them in the same Crosse. They except heere against this translation, namely of the last words, as if the true reading were not *en autō* in the same with reference to *Crosse*, but *en hautō* in himselfe. We aunswer: First, Howsoeuer the reading bee, this doctrine cannot bee impeached notwithstanding, that *Christ on the Crosse* did all those meritorious and triumphant actions ouer sinne and Sathan which are heere in the *Colossians* specified. I say this doctrine is manifest still, euen by the expresse wordes which are there found: If you translate *he triumphed in himselfe*, the meaning is *by himselfe there on the Crosse*. For all those words & phrases they haue apparant & vndenyable cohærence and certaine reference to that tyme and place: *He put out the hand writing of ordinances that was any way against vs, he euen tooke it out of the way fastening it to the Crosse* [a] *hauing* (then also) *spoyled Principalityes and powers, hee made a shew of thē openly* * *hauing triumphed ouer them by himselfe*. By himselfe? where? euen *there on the Crosse* most apparantly. For *where* he took away all things that made any way against vs, *there* he spoyled the Diuells & triumphed ouer thē: all the words heere beeing iointly of one and the same *tyme*, and that also not the *future* but the tyme *now past*. But he tooke away all things any way

[a] *Apekdysamenos.*

* *Thriambeusas.*

But the Holy Ghost giueth vs to know the *contrarie* touching Christ and his sufferings. For his *suffering* was his *victorie*, & his *dying* his *triumph*. But he meaneth not *actually*: for while hee suffered, and while he dyed, this was a miserable triumph: and still he suffered, euen till he gaue vp the Ghost. Therefore the meaning heere is not of any *actuall* triumph: but onely *by vertue* of that which there he suffered, hee triumphed indeed, and the *Crosse* whereon he was lifted vp was like *a triumphing Chariot*. All this is thus named because the *effect* of those sufferinges simplie was the moste perfite treading vnder feet of Sathan and of all infernall powers. But nowe his *triumphing in Hell* can be nothing so. Either in Hell it was *actuall*, which is monstruous absurd: for then Hell was the entrance of his *Glorifying*, which all the worlde knoweth is the moste inglorious and vilest debasinge. Or at least his verie presense was *inwrtorious, and virtually triumphant*: and this is flatly blasphemous against the allsufficient merit of the *Crosse* of Christ.

Dilemma.

Heere some will aske, howe doth this derogate from the *Crosse* of Christe, if hee *triumphed* in Hell? Because *hee triumphed on his Crosse*, yea perfitlie: therefore hee did not in *Hell*. But it is doubted, yea denyed that Christ triūphed at all on the Crosse. Let the Scripture then speake;

Obiection.

Answere.

to en hypenantion hemin what soeuer was any way against vs he tooke it out of the way, and fastened it to the Crosse, hauing spoyled Principalities and powers, made a shewe of them openly, and hath triumphed ouer them in the same Crosse. They except heere against this translation, namely of the last words, as if the true reading were not *en autō* in the same with reference to *Crosse*, but *en hautō* in himselfe. We aunswer: First, Howsoeuer the reading bee, this doctrine cannot bee impeached notwithstanding, that *Christ on the Crosse* did all those meritorious and triumphant actions ouer sinne and Sathan which are heere in the *Colossians* specified. I say this doctrine is manifest still, euen by the expresse wordes which are there found: If you translate *he triumphed in himselfe*, the meaning is *by himselfe there on the Crosse*. For all those words & phrases they haue apparant & vndenyable cohærence and certaine reference to that tyme and place: *He put out the hand writing of ordinances that was any way against vs, he euen tooke it out of the way fastening it to the Crosse, * hauing* (then also) *spoyled Principalityes and powers, hee made a soew of thē openly * hauing triumphed ouer them by himselfe.* By himselfe? where? euen *there on the Crosse* most apparantly. For *where* he took away all things that made any way against vs, *there* he spoyled the Diuells & triumphed ouer thē: all the words heere beeing iointly of one and thesame *tyme*, and that also not the *future* but the tyme *now past*. But he tooke away all things any way

* Apokdysamenos.

* Thriambeusas.

way against vs *on the Crosse*, and fastened the hande writing of our inditement *on the Crosse*, the text sayeth. Therefore all the reste was *there* don also. Wherevnto other Scriptures also beeinge compared doe giue further light. * *Through death hee destroyed*, not simply conquered, but *destroyed* and *abolished him that had the power of death, that is the Diuell*. And this is the true sense also of that finall speach of his, beeing about to strike the laste blowe at his aduersary, † *It is finished*. What is finished? surely all that hee had to doe with *any aduersary*, or *any contrary thing* to our freedom; euen there and then hee finished it. And heereof is that vehemente ‖ speach of Christ though spoken before he was apprehéded: *Now is the iudgement of this worlde: now shall the Prince of this world be cast out*. Hee saith *cast out*, as if hee neuer appeared any more in his sight after that most absolute victory *on the Crosse*: * for thereof he speaketh in this place, as † before wee haue seene. Thus then appeareth plainly this doctrine, that *Christ on the Crosse* did all and euery one of his victorious actiõs against Sathã, & wrought meritoriously our full deliuerance frõ him, so that no iot of his right nor power against vs remayned after that, but there *hee spoyled him*, there *hee confidently triumphed*, and *made a shew openly of him*, and trode him vnder foote for euer: he so beate him & so destroyed his power

that

* Heb. 2. 14.

† Ioh. 19. 30.

‖ Ioh. 12. 31.

* *Hee spake of the death that he should dye: ver. 33.*

† *Pag. 61.*

that there was no feare by any thing should once stirre against him or vs afterward. This is meant by *Christes triumphing on the Crosse*. For els indeed a pitions triumph it was, where himselfe remayned in such wofull torments, where appeared no shew of conquest, but rather of being conquered. Therefore this is spoken *in regard of the effect* which came of this action, not of the simple action (or rather *passion*) it self. What *effect*? *An effect* rare and strange, nothing like, yea contrarie to that which happeneth in like case amongst men. When they in fight are beaten, & wounded, and slaine, they are conquered: but Christ euen in beeing beaten, and wounded, and slaine, therein hee conquered, and triumphed, and led openlie his enemies in captiuitie. Nowe hee saith *openly*, not that Christe did this openly and euidently to our senses, but alluding to the maner of conquerours in their triumphes, who lead in *open shew* those enemyes which henceforth cannot once stirre against them any more: so hee signifieth that the *effect of Christes very death* was such, and so forcible indeede, and fully to bee compared with these doings of *perfect conquerours*: and therefore most *emphatically* he setteth it out in these termes.

His triumph on the Crosse was in regard of the effect which it wrought.

Thus farre this doctrine is iustifyed of *Christes triumphing on the Crosse*, howsoeuer the reading be in those last words of that text

text. Howbeit the trueth is, this reading *en autō* in the same Crosse, which wee in our common translations vse after *Beza*, is no forgerie of *Beza*. But that noble instrument of God doeth shewe, as many other things most worthie and profitable to the Church of God, so this to bee no new, but a most ancient, and in all likelihood, the common reading in old time, or at least to that very effect. *Oecumenius* the Greeke Scholiast doeth both read and interprete this place plainly thus: who commonly sheweth what the Greeke Churches vse was. *Origen* who was farre elder, if he read not *en autō* in the same Crosse, yet he read *en xylo in ligno* on the tree, which in effect is all one. And thus not onely *Origen*, but also *Cyprian*, *Ierome*, with many others. So that if a Romish Priest had traduced M. *Beza* for leauing heere their vulgar Latin translation, it had bene shamefull wrong to that faithfull seruaunt of God: Howe much more when brethrē, as they seeme, doe so disgrace him, or rather the trueth of God in him? Thus then it is manifest that *Christ triumphed ouer Sathan on the Crosse*. And then to doe it againe in *Hell*, were superfluous and vaine: nay it were iniurious to the *Crosse* of Christ, as if it were not sufficiently nor perfitely there done.

Col. 2. 15.

Beza.

¶ Homil. in Exod. 4.

ee Cypri. de Passione.

* Ierem. Algas. quæst. 3.

Obiection.

If any say, That parable in the Gospel signifieth as much, that Christ bound the Diuel in Hell. † *When a strong man armed keepeth*

† Luk. 11. 21. 22.

keth his pallace, the things that he possesseth are in peace. But when a stronger then he commeth vpon him, and ouercommeth him, hee taketh from him, all his armour, and deuideth his spoyles. This *strong mans Palace* is Hell, where Christ, which is the *stronger man comming vpon* Sathan, *spoyleth him, &c.* A fine toy, or rather a shamefull gloze, by vnsauoury Allegorizing so to corrupt the text. Is this a good way to proue *articles* of Faith, viz. by *allegories*? A better sense heereof may be giuen, and more to Christes purpose. That is, Christ *really dispossessed* Satã out of some in those times that were once really *possessed*, but afterward by him, *a stronger* then Sathan, cleerely freed. Also consequentlie it may be meant of the *Spirituall casting out* of Sathã out of Gods elect, who *by Nature* through sinne hath *possession* of all men: but *by Gods grace and the Ministerie* of his worde, he is *cast out* when Christ calleth vs and sanctifyeth vs vnto himselfe. Wherefore in a worde there is no holde for you in the Scriptures, but they are vtterlie *against* all *going downe of Christ into Hell.*

Answer.

* Ephe. 2. 1.

3.

Which we may gather likewise *by the Historie of the Euangelistes*, who write the doeings of Christ exactlie, all that † wee ought to beleeue: and of all other, his *Death and Resurrection* most specially. But in all of them there is not a worde of any *going downe to Hell.* Therefore there is no

† Ioh. 20. 30. 31.

such thing to bee beleeued.

4. *The very Apostolike Creed found in Scripture wanteth this article of Christs going to Hell after Death.*

Which also may further appeare by that singular *recapitulatio* in the Apostle of certaine precise Articles of our faith, and namelie of these wherein *Christes full victorie* for our perfite deliuerance is orderlie and sufficiently set downe, as the Church it seemeth generally held in those tymes. * *I haue chiefly deliuered vnto you, that which I haue receaued, that Christ "dyed for our sinnes according to the Scripture, and that hee was buryed, and that he arose the thirde day according to the Scriptures.* This was the full foundation of Faith in those dayes, by whiche if a man beleeued he might be saued, and which if he beleeued not, hee beleeued † in vaine. Whence it ariseth that Paul had heere great and iust occasion to haue specified this seuerall and waightie Article, that Christ went also into Hell, if anie such thing were then beleeued. Hee nameth the *Articles* both before and after this. His *Dying*, *Burial*, and *Resurrection*: hee ought not to haue skipped his *Going into Hell*, to saue vs from Hell, if those wordes in our common *Creede* had anie such meaning, if it had any diuers meaning from all those mẽtioned articles, and so waightie a sense as some suppose. It will not be excused to say, The Apostle meant heere to proue our Resurrection onely; and therefore would speake of purpose, but onely of Christes Death and Resurrec-

* 1. Cor. 15. 2, 3, 4.

" The very same in effect seemeth to haue ben deliuered to this same purpose by Christ himselfe Luk. 24. 46, 47.

† ver. 2.

tion, from whence he might argue ours likewise. I graunt, that this is his maine purpose in deede: but when hee sayeth, *Except you haue beleeued in vayne*, he meaneth that wee *beleeue in vayne*, not onely if wee holde not the Resurrection, but also if we holde not those speciall Articles of Faith touching Christes *sufferinges and victorie for vs*, which there presentlie hee nameth: and consequentlie if wee holde them, then that *we beleeue not in vaine*, but euen those to be sufficient. Whence it followeth, and it is most certaine, that their fancie of *Christes going downe into Hell*, is superfluous, and excluded out of this vndoubted *Apostles Creed*, and out of the Holie Scriptures.

No end nor vse of Christes going locally into Hell after his death Therfore he went not.

Thus farre wee haue seene the Scriptures against this deuice: Nowe it were good to see if there bee any *vse* at all or *Ende*, that his Descendinge into Hell may haue. If there can bee no *ende* nor *vse* at all, no benefite to the Godlie thereby, then it is idle, and vaine, and a very dreame, and nothinge els. But there can be no certaine *vse* at all, and especiallie no commoditie nor benefite to the Godly by it. Therefore it is a dreame. For what good is there so much as pretended? The generall Redemption of all Gods elect & chosen people was wrought and fullie finished on the Crosse, euen to the Cancelling of the very writinges,

5.

and taking away of whatsoeuer was anie way against vs: as hath bene shewed before. What could his *going downe into Hell* adde more? Neither was it any peculiar good to the godlie then deceased before: for they were all in Heauen immediatlie euen then, as well as we that dye since: as we haue proued already. If then it be no way profitable to any of Gods children, what if it were so that the *Diuells* and *reprobate* in Hel might be *more cõfounded* by such his locall descending? yet see I not, neyther can I beleeue *howe it may be amonge the Artricles of our Creede*, all which in trueth *auayle* singularly to Gods owne childrens speciall good. It can not be I say in the *Articles* of our faith, if it directly profit not the Godly. Yea and touching the further daunting and confounding of the damned; that is a sillie shift God knoweth, & vayneſt reason of all, that Christ should goe to *triumph* and *insult* vpõ the thrise miserable and wofull wretches in their present vnspeakeable Damnation infinitlie confounded alreadie. Sure a very sorie *triumph* this were for the Sonne of GOD, which euen among mẽ were nothing but dishonorable. Yea a beast, the *Lyon*, they say, hauing but the instinct of Nature, yet he refuseth to insult and pray vppon the pitiefull & helples creatures. And would *the Lion of the Tribe of Iudah* take pleasure to goe thither only to insult farther vppon

the

the miſerable damned? I deny not but the wicked in torments might conceaue further horror, and the bleſſed in heauē further ioyes by the actuall death of Chriſt: but that might full eaſilie bee by the vertue and efficacie of the power of the Godhead deriuing ſome fence thereof to all, howe and when it pleaſeth him. There needed *no locall Deſcending into Hell*, nor *Aſcending to Heauen* for that matter. Neyther in deed did hee *Deſcende*, becauſe it is certaine he did not *Aſcende* for any ſuch purpoſe, for ought that we any where reade. 5.
Neither ſurely ſhould the Damned haue bene viſited *firſte*, and the Bleſſed *laſt*, yea ſo long after, that is 40. dayes after his death was paſt. But contrariwiſe the Godlie in all reaſon ſhould *firſt* haue had his preſence to certifie them, and then the wicked *afterward*, if any ſuch *locall* cōming and going for giuing notice had bene required. Wherefore this remayneth that there was no vſe, no *good* at all by Chriſtes Soules deſcending into Hell. And Mr *Hall* in ſaying [a] *He thereby perſonally redeemed vs frō Hell*, and [b] *If Chriſts Soule had not, Dauids Soule muſt, and his, & ours haue gone to Hell*, doth no leſſe then derogate frō the *Croſſe* of Chriſt, and blaſpheme his allſufficient death. Also if his Soule *muſt goe* thither of neceſſitie to ſaue our ſoules thence, why *went not* his Body too, for to ſaue our bodyes thence? But of theſe preſumptuous & groſſe va- 6. 7.

A bad aſſertion.
[a] *Hall Sect. 14*
[b] *Sect. 5.*

nities we haue sayd enough, & to much alreadie, but that necessitie hath inforced vs.

Howbeit yet let vs goe a little further. The *Creede* it selfe being viewed and marked, will plainly yeelde another meaning of these words, through a right *distributing* of the Articles thereof: *viz.* those that concerne Christes *Office* in being our Sauiour and Redeemer. These are all of 2 sortes: some touching his *Humiliation*, and some his *Glorificatiõ*. The Articles of Christes *Humiliation* I suppose euery sensible man will confesse to be these, *Hee suffered, was Crucifyed, Dead, Buryed, Descended to the Dead*, or *to Hell*: and those of his *Glorification* to be only these: *The third day he rose againe, he Ascended into Heauen, he sitteth at the right hande of God, and thence he shall come to iudgement*. Which if it be the very naturall and necessarie *Diuision* of these Articles of the *Creede*, as it is in deede, thẽ this ouerthroweth wholy their opiniõ, and stablisheth ours, that Christ went not downe into Hell: namely *not to triumph*, for then this was not the lowest point of his *Humiliatiõ*, but the first of his *Glorification*. Which can stand with no sense in this place: & therefore he descended not by our very *Creede* into Hell at all.

9.

By the very order of our Creed Christ went not into Hell.

10.

By other sufficient Creedes Christ went not into Hell.

Moreouer we finde almost all the *Creeds* and Rules of Christian faith, certainlie the most & the ancientest & the best (be-

side

side this called the *Apostolike Creed*) to want these wordes of *Christes descending* altogither. These *Creedes* or summes of our faith we finde in * *Ignatius*, † *Irenaeus*, " *Iust. Mart.* * *Tertull.* † *Origen.* " *Athanas.* * *Augustin Symbol: Nic. Constantinop: 1. Toletan: 1.* and † *Ephesin: 1.* &c. Which whosoeuer did hold, they were euer acknowledged true and sound Christians. And God forbid that such precise and exact *Summaries* of Christianitie should be thought defectiue in any needfull point. Therefore all these neuer thought that *Christes going downe into Hell* (as some nowe vrge it) was any distinct and certaine *Article* of Christiã faith. But how then is it possible that these perfit and famous *Creede* should want that whiche our *common Creede* hath? Surely * *Ruffinus* sheweth, *Vis verbi eadem videtur esse, in eo quod sepultus dicitur.* The effect of this Article *He descended to Infernum* seemeth (sayeth he) to bee the same with this, *Hee was buryed.* Whereby euen the *Ancients* do appeare to cõsent with vs here in effect, that these wordes of Christs going to *Hades* or *Infernum* in our Creede doe signifie no more in deed, then the former wordes there signified, and that this was added but for *Emphasis* sake to shewe more plainly that he was truely dead in deede, as we † before obserued. And certainly vnles this were so, all those moste excellent Creedes before mentioned, ought not in any wise so vtterly to want it, as they doe.

* *Ad Magnet.*
† *Lib. 1 cap. 2.*
" *Apol 2*
* *De prescr. aduers. har. & contr. Prax.*
† *De princip.*
" *Ad Epictet.*
* *Ad Pot. Diac.*
† *Cap. 13.*

* *In Symbol.*

Note Ruffinus.

† Pag. 127. 128.

Alſo howe generallie this was wantinge, *Ruffinus* ſheweth heerewithall, *Sciẽdum ſane eſt quod in Eccleſia Romana Symbolo non habetur additum, Deſcendit ad inferna, ſed nec in Orientis Eccleſiis habetur hic Sermo:* Wee muſt knowe verilie, that the Church of Romes Creed hath not this added, He went vnto the Dead, neyther is this clauſe in the Eaſt Churches. But ſo generally, and ſo farr and wide in the Criſtian worlde, a neceſſarie *Article*, diſtinct from the reſt, neyther was, nor could be wanting: ſpecially ſeeing they al found it in the *Apoſtolike Creed* expreſly put in. Therefore it muſt needes be, I thinke, they all tooke it but to ſignifie in effect the ſame as *Dead* and *Buryed*: yea euen in the common *Creede* called *Apoſtolike*. And therefore they * ſometime vſed thoſe expreſſe wordes, & ſomtime they vſed them not: and yet they neuer differed, they neither aboũded nor wanted in their maine ſenſe. And ſo it could not meane with them, *that Chriſt went to Hell.*

* *Athanas. Symb. &c.*

Obiection. Now it remaineth *Vt res ad Triarios redeat*, that this matter may bee holpen with the laſt, the beſt, & the only ſuccour: that is ſome of the particular *Fathers*. What ſay they? Doe they teach that Chriſt after death, went downe into *Hell*. I denye that alſo: the *Fathers* teach not ſo. Taking *Hell* as in Engliſh properly we always meane, for the very place of the damned. I graũt many of them thought that he went to *Limbus patrum*: though this name bee not found in them, but was framed by the

Answere.

Schoole-

Schoolmen since. Howbeit such a place they dreamed of, as was out of *Heauen*, they thought in ỹ deep of the earth, whéce he fetch'd the soules of ỹ Patriarks out, & caried thé vp with him to *Heauen*. Which opinion the Papistes haue laid fast hold on since euē till this day, hauing also increased it with other fables. And thus in deed som of ỹ *Auncients* imagined & ghessed by reason of their mistaking of the Greeke *Hades* in the cōmon *Creed*, and in the Scriptures, and somwhat also by mistaking the old vse of the Latin *Infers*, wherwith they commonly vsed to translate *Hades*, as before I haue largely declared. When they once mistooke these words, and specially *Hades*, to signifie *Hell* properly, then they could not but deuise some likely matter of it, & some purpose for it, which els had bene ridiculous. And yet euen heerein they spake waueringlie & ambiguouslie: a token indeed that they spake they knew not what, as in * *Augustin* we may see. But I hope with vs euery where *istha tamprídem explosa sententia est*, This old rotten errour is abhorred: which I also haue refuted briefly before. How be it in a worde, the *Fathers* knewe not this our present opinion in Controuersie now, that he went locallie into the Hell of the damned, and not to any *Limbus*. Herein they that hold against vs haue no helpe at the *Fathers* handes, whatsoeuer they pretend. It begā not

* *August. Epist 99.*

The Fathers are not for Christs descending into the Hell of the Damned.

not I suppose till about Mai *Luthers* time, when they sawe somewhat of the Popish errours heerein, but could not presentlie bee purged from all their filth. Nowe since that tyme diuers of our Protestants, though they left in deed the olde Popish *Limbo*, yet not discerning but that surelie Christ went into *Hell* after death (because I thinke sundrie of the Fathers in wordes make shewe of some such vncouth thing) therefore they deuised a fresh howe this might be, and wherefore. Some thought to suffer torments there, some not to suffer in anie wise, but to triumph forsooth in *Hell*, and some knewe not why he went to *Hell*, but thither he went they thought. And some, that hee went and came agayne from thence presently, not staying two houres in *Hell*: others that he stayed there all the while till his Resurrection. In the ende of Maister *Humes against. D. Hill*, we may see how diuerslie they thought herein who were the defendours, yea the beginners of this opinion. Scarce any of them agree with an other, it seemeth: & with those of vs in England that leane this way, not one of thē all that are strangers, doe seeme fully to consent. But whether they doe or no, whether any of the olde or newe Writers say of or on, it maketh no great matter. Wee haue learned Christ Iesus otherwise, thē to stay our holy faith on the credit of any man, or men.

The contrarietie about Christes descending into Hell.

Our

Our treatise I hope before grouded wholy on Gods word, hath sufficiently cleered this point to be but a deuise of mē, a meer forgery, & no truth in Religion at al: yea & so much the more hatefull, as that it is vrged to be taken as one of the *Articles* of faith. In which our deniall neither want we the cōsent of mē. The *Ancients* we haue noted before: the late Godly Christians are many & most famous that giue their ioint consent with vs heerin. The beste reformed Churches, the *French*, *Dutch*, *Helvetian*, and *Scottish*, with all their most worthy and learned Pastors in them are with vs. And to speake of our selues in *England*: first all our most famous & learned Teachers in her Maiest. time haue so taught, *Mr Fulke*, *Mr Whitakers*, *Mr Rainolds*, *Mr Deering*, *&c. Mr Nowel* some think holdeth contrarie. The good old Father liueth, and therfore himself can shew his own mind therin best. As for his * words that bee extant, they proue it not: Christs soule beeing separate frō his body *descendit ad inferos*: whiche we may well interpret thus, *it went Vnto the Dead*, or *amonge the Dead*, as wee haue shewed before that *Inferi* or *Infernum* may signifie. And speciallie we may thinke his meaning in those wordes was not against the manifest meaning of our whole * *Synod*: whose doctrine was well knowen to him, and is our publike doctrine, and estabilished by *Lawe* in Englande.

The consent of many Godlie learned in this that Christe went not properly into Hell.

* *In Catech.*

* *Anno. 1562.*

This

not I suppose till about Mai *Luthers* time, when they sawe somewhat of the Popish errours heerein, but could not presentlie bee purged from all their filth. Nowe since that tyme diuers of our Protestants, though they left in deed the olde Popish *Limbo*, yet not discerning but that surelie Christ went in to *Hell* after death (because I thinke sundrie of the Fathers in wordes make shewe of some such vncouth thing) therefore they deuised a fresh howe this might be, and wherefore. Some thought to suffer torments there, some not to suffer in anie wise, but to triumph forsooth in *Hell*, and some knewe not why he went to *Hell*, but thither he went they thought. And some, that hee went and came agayne from thence presently, not staying two houres in *Hell*: others that he stayed there all the while till his Resurrection. In the ende of Maister *Humes against. D. Hill*, we may see how diuerslie they thought herein who were the defendours, yea the beginners of this opinion. Scarce any of them agree with an other, it seemeth: & with those of vs in England that leane this way, not one of thē all that are strangers, doe seeme fully to consent. But whether they doe or no, whether any of the olde or newe Writers say of or on, it maketh no great matter. Wee haue learned Christ Iesus otherwise, thē to stay our holy faith on the credit of any man, or men.

The contrarieties about Christes descending into Hell.

Our

Our treatise I hope before grouñded wholy on Gods word, hath sufficiently cleered this point to be but a deuise of mẽ, a meer forgery, & no truth in Religion at al: yea & so much the more hatefull, as that it is vrged to be taken as one of the *Articles* of faith. In which our deniall neither want we the cõsent of mẽ. The *Ancients* we haue noted before: the late Godly Christians are many & most famous that giue their ioint consent with vs heerin. The beste reformed Churches, the *French*, *Dutch*, *Helvetian*, and *Scottish*, with all their most worthy and learned Pastors in them are with vs. And to speake of our selues in *England*: first all our most famous & learned Teachers in her Maiest. time haue so taught, *Mr Fulke*, *Mr Whitakers*, *Mr Raimolds*, *Mr Deering*, *&c. Mr Newel* some think holdeth contrarie. The good old Father liueth, and therfore himself can shew his own mind therin best. As for his * words that bee extant, they proue it not: Christs soule beeing separate frõ his body *descendit ad inferos*: whiche we may well interpret thus, *it went vnto the Dead*, or *amonge the Dead*, as wee haue shewed before that *Inferi* or *Infernum* may signifie. And speciallie we may thinke his meaning in those wordes was not against the manifest meaning of our whole * *Synod*: whose doctrine was well knowen to him, and is our publike doctrine, and estabrished by *Lawe* in Englande.

The consent of many Godlie learned in this that Christe went not properly into Hell.

* *In Catech.*

* *Anno. 1562.*

This

The Doctrine renounced and eſtabliſhed in England is againſt Chriſtes going into Hell properly.

This *Synod* apparãtly renounceth this doctrine of Chriſtes going downe to the *Hell* of the damned. But howe appeareth it? Euen thus: The *Synod* before holden in K. *Edwardes* time affirmed this doctrine directly and expreſly. This *Synod* comming after doth correct and amend this very article of the former. It repeateth and ratifieth parte thereof in expreſſe wordes: but parte of it, euen all and euery whit that contayneth this doctrine expreſly of Chriſts going down to the Hell of the damned, all this I ſay, † our Synod cutteth of, it putteth out, it caſteth away. Therefore our *Synod* renounceth apparantly this ſenſe of the *Creede*, that Chriſt deſended to the *Hell* of the damned. The words are theſe of the former Synod: *Quemadmodum Chriſtus pro nobis mortuus eſt & ſepultus, ita eſt etiam credendus ad inferos deſcendiſſe. Nam Corpus vſque ad reſurrectionem in ſepulchro iacuit, ſpiritus ab illo emiſſus cum ſpiritibus qui in carcere ſiue in inferno detinebantur fuit, illiſq; prædicauit, quemadmodum teſtatur Petri locus.* In whiche laſt wordes they in deede expreſſie determine that Chriſt went in his ſoule after death into the Hell of the damned: and no maruaile in them, who did but newlie peepe out of Poperie. But our Synode ſince correcteth it heerein, and ſaieth but thus only, *Quemadmodum Chriſtus pro nobis mortuus eſt & ſepultus, ita eſt etiam credendus ad inferos deſcẽdiſſe:* As Chriſt dyed for vs and was buried,

† Anno 1562.

ſo

& wee are to beleeue also that he went vnto the Dead.

That he went into the *Hell* of the damned, which followed expreſlie in all the next wordes, this they wholy corrected, ſuppreſſed, and refuſed. This therefore in them is ſeene manifeſtlie (as I ſaide) to renounce and abrogate this particular ſenſe of Chriſts deſcending, that he went after death into *Hell*. If any ſay, Our *Synod* leaueth it free to any conuenient ſenſe, it denyeth none. Firſt, then it is graunted, as in deede it is true, they would haue none puniſhed for holding any probable ſenſe heerein, though he thinke not that *Chriſt went into Hell*. Secondly, I ſay this is true alſo and manifeſt by the præmiſſes, that they leaue in deede this *Article* of our *Creed* to any conuenient ſenſe, they denie none, ſauing onely this which before in *K. Edwardes* tyme was expreſlie commanded, and is here with vs ſpecially put out. By putting it out, they denye this apparantlie. Therefore I conclude, if we note this well, it can not be denyed but the publike ſentence of our Churches, yea the * *Lawe* of our Land confirming the ſame, as wel as the Holy Scripture which is the Lawe of God, is againſt this opinion of Chriſtes deſcending into *Hell*.

Obiection.

Anſwere.

The Lawe in England is againſt Chriſtes going into Hell properly.

* *Act of Parl. anno Eliz. 13. Cap. 12.*

All which being duely conſidered, I maruaile that a man of learning and wiſdome as he is thought, who hath openlie impugned this doctrine of late, would ſo raſh-

The Doctrine renounced and eſtabliſhed in England is againſt Chriſtes going into Hell properly.

This *Synod* apparãtly renounceth this doctrine of Chriſtes going downe to the *Hell* of the damned. But howe appeareth it? Euen thus: The *Synod* before holden in K. *Edwardes* time affirmed this doctrine directly and expreſly. This *Synod* comming after doth correct and amend this very article of the former. It repeateth and ratifieth parte thereof in expreſſe wordes: but parte of it, euen all and euery whit that contayneth this doctrine expreſly of Chriſts going down to the Hell of the damned, all this I ſay, † our Synod cutteth of, it putteth out, it caſteth away. Therefore our *Synod* renounceth apparantly this ſenſe of the *Creede*, that Chriſt deſended to the *Hell* of the damned. The words are theſe of the former Synod: *Quemadmodum Chriſtus pro nobis mortuus eſt & ſepultus, ita eſt etiam credendus ad inferos deſcendiſſe. Nam Corpus vſque ad reſurrectionem in ſepulchro iacuit, ſpiritus ab illo emiſſus cum ſpiritibus qui in carcere ſive in inferno detinebantur fuit, illoſq; prædicauit, quemadmodum teſtatur Petri locus.* In whiche laſt wordes they in deede expreſſie determine that Chriſt went in his ſoule after death into the Hell of the damned: and no maruaile in them, who did but newlie peepe out of Poperie. But our Synode ſince correcteth it heerein, and ſaieth but thus only, *Quemadmodum Chriſtus pro nobis mortuus eſt & ſepultus, ita eſt etiam credendus ad inferos deſcẽdiſſe:* As Chriſt dyed for vs and was buried,

† *Anno 1563.*

so

& wee are to beleeue alſo that he went vnto the Dead.

That he went into the *Hell* of the damned, which followed expreſlie in all the next wordes, this they wholy corrected, ſuppreſſed, and refuſed. This therefore in them is ſeene manifeſtlie (as I ſaide) to renounce and abrogate this particular ſenſe of Chriſts deſcending, that he went after death into *Hell*. If any ſay, Our *Synod* leaueth it free to any conuenient ſenſe, it denyeth none. Firſt, then it is graunted, as in deede it is true, they would haue none puniſhed for holding any probable ſenſe heerein, though he thinke not that *Chriſt went into Hell*. Secondly, I ſay this is true alſo and manifeſt by the præmiſſes, that they leaue in deede this *Article* of our *Creed* to any conuenient ſenſe, they denie none, ſauing onely this which before in *K. Edwardes* tyme was expreſlie commanded, and is here with vs ſpecially put out. By putting it out, they denye this apparantlie. Therefore I conclude, if we note this well, it can not be denyed but the publike ſentence of our Churches, yea the * *Lawe* of our Land confirming the ſame, as wel as the Holy Scripture which is the Lawe of God, is againſt this opinion of Chriſtes deſcending into *Hell*.

Obiection.

Anſwere.

The Lawe in England is againſt Chriſtes going into Hell properly.

* *Act of Parl. anno Eliz. 13. Cap. 12.*

All which being duely conſidered, I maruaile that a man of learning and wiſdome as he is thought, who hath openlie impugned this doctrine of late, would ſo raſh-

raſhlie runne into theſe errours, and ſo vainly defend them afterwardes, that hee would rather Gods Church ſhould bee pitiouſly diſturbed about them, as now it is, then that his ill conceites ſhould bee kept to himſelfe. And for my parte, my truſt is, that in reſiſting theſe fanſies and notable errours of Chriſtes ſuffering for vs *only in Fleſh*, and of his *Soule deſcending into Hell*, ſauouring ſo ſtrongly of Popery, and vanitie, I haue done according to my power, without reſpect of perſons, but what in conſcience I owe both to God, and to his Church, & to our whole ſtate. And thus the Lorde in mercy will yet (I doubt not) beate downe errour, and aduance his trueth ſtill, yea euen by making thinges that are not to bring to nought thinges that are, that his own Name may haue all the glorie.

Amen.

7 NO 55

2. Cor. 2. 17.

Wee are not as many, which make marchandiſe of the Worde of God: but as of ſincerite, but as of God, in the ſight of God ſpeake we in Chriſt.

H. I.

† in margin.

Pagin.	Lin.	Faultes:	Corections.	
9.	19.	*the seed of Angells*	*the Angells*,	
9.	26	*against his* our body	*against his own body*,	* in margin.
37.	† 5 last	*for him vs.*	*him for vs.*	
63.	31.	*put out* two things		
68.	30.	*contrarie haste*	*contrite harte*	
73.	*	See pag. 49.	See pag. 50.	
74.	25.	signified	signifieth	
86.	29.	bviect	obiect	
97.	23.	*heme*	*eme*	
111.	15.	executed	exercised	
111.	28.	‘‘ former	former	
111.	29.	falleth	‘‘ falleth	
121.	9.	*the death*,	*the dead*,	
127.	20.	the signifie	to signifie	
139.	9.	attributed	not attributed	
139.	10.	not of	of	
31.	32.	outward indeed, *after*	yea only his very Death, yet &c. *read*	
50.	33.	not possible *after*	therefore *read*	
52.	18.	willing purpose:	yea againste his moste holy patience, & heauenlie fortitude:	